Theoretical and Discussion Journal of the Communist Party

MARXISM TODAY

Three shillings and sixpence (17p)

January 1971

Contents

Editorial Comments

Bert Pearce — The Strategy of Socialist Revolution in Britain

Bruce Burns — Trends in British Psychiatry

Document :

F. Engels — Draft of a Communist Credo, 1847

Discussion :

Arthur Turner, Jack Evans — Socialism, Democracy and the One-Party System

THE STRATEGY OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION IN BRITAIN

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM TODAY

THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Volume 15 Number 1

Editor James Klugmann
Editorial Board Professor J. D. Bernal/Gabriel Carritt/Jack Cohen/Maurice Cornforth/Maurice Dobb John Foster/John Gollan/Arnold Kettle/John Mahon/Alan Morton/Bert Pearce/Michael Seifert/George Wake/Nick Wright

Editorial Correspondence James Klugmann, 16 King Street, WC2

Advertisements Doris Allison, above address

Orders and Subscriptions Usual agents or Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1

Subscription rates £2.50 (£2 10s.) per annum

CONTENTS

	Editorial Comments	**1**
Bert Pearce	**The Strategy of Socialist Revolution in Britain**	**6**
Bruce Burns	**Trends in British Psychiatry**	**19**
Document:		
F. Engels	**Draft of a Communist Credo, 1847**	**27**
Discussion:		
Arthur Turner / **Jack Evans**	**Socialism, Democracy and the One-Party System**	**30**

AMONGST ARTICLES IN FEBRUARY AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Bert Baker	**Television Today**
Bill Baker	**The SDF and the Boer War**
Alan Bold	**Modernism in Modern Life**
Mick Costello	**Anarchist Ideas Today**
Mary Davis	**The Fraternal Democrats**
P. Feltham	**Bird's Eye View of Soviet Science**
Communist Party of Israel	**Nature of Zionism**
Martin Jacques	**Notes on Intellectuals**
John Oakley	**Marcuse and Marxism**
David Pavett	**Lucien Seve on the Theory of Personality**
Fritz Platten	**Lenin's Return in a Sealed Coach**
Christopher Strachan	**May-June 1968 in France: a Retrospect**
"Voprosy Istorii"	**Some Problems on the Theory of the Nation: Results of the Discussion**
Willie Thompson	**Chomsky**

The March 1971 issue will be a Special Issue on The Paris Commune

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

DECEMBER 8th—the biggest "turn-out" of workers since 1926, was the first, magnificent blow against the Tory Government's attempt to shackle the trade unions.

In the absence of a fighting call for action by the TUC, this great day of struggle was the outcome of initiative "from below". It was decided on at a conference on November 14th, 1970 called by the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions, which was attended by 1,800 delegates (the figure could have been 2,500 but credentials were stopped three days before the conference due to lack of accomodation). These delegates came from six trade union executives, 36 union District Committees, 300 trade union branches, 55 trades councils, and 155 Shop Stewards Committees.

Key factories and industrial establishments whose names are household words were represented. As the *Times* (16.11.70) wrote:

> "The list of delegates . . . read like a roll-call of British industry: employees at Ford, British Leyland, Shell, ICI, Upper Clyde Shipbuilders, British Rail, The Scottish coalfields, Liverpool and London Docks, and Rolls-Royce were all represented".

So much for the press, radio and television outcry that this was some kind of secret conspiracy engineered by a few "trouble-makers".

It is calculated that at least 700,000 workers struck work on December 8th. Demonstrations took place in many important towns, London where 30,000 marched to Hyde Park and where later there was a huge lobby of MP's, Liverpool where 20,000 marched, Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, Cardiff, etc.

A splendid feature was the participation everywhere of large numbers of students as well as university and other teachers who linked their own demands with the fight against the Bill.

This is only the beginning. Further activities are called for especially in connection with January 12th, when the TUC is organising a large demonstration in the Albert Hall and has called for similar meetings and demonstrations throughout the country "outside working hours if necessary".

The Liaison Committee has called on all workers:—

> " (1) . . . to make January 12th an even more widespread and powerful Day of National Industrial Action.
>
> (2) We call on all trade union organisations to demand that the General Council recall Congress immediately. The present intention of mid-March is far too late.
>
> (3) On the day of jhe Special Congress we call for a nationwide day of industrial action and demonstrations . . . also for a mass lobby . . . to lobby the Special Congress.
>
> (4) We call for every job, branch, and District and Executive Committee to take all forms of action to intensify the campaign to defeat the Bill."

CHILE BEGINS ITS MARCH TO SOCIALISM

"What kind of Chile are we inheriting?", asked Dr. Salvador Allende in his first political speech after becoming President of the Republic of Chile.[1] We have received a society, he answered:

> "torn by social inequality; a society divided into antagonistic classes of the exploited and exploiting; a society in which violence is a part of the institutions themselves, which condemns man to a never-satisfied greed, the most inhuman forms of cruelty and indifference in the face of the suffering of others. . . .
>
> "We have received a dependent society, one whose basic sources of income were alienated by the internal allies of the great international firms. We are dependent in the economic, cultural, technological and political fields".

Dr. Allende spoke then, in the clearest terms, of the specific character of the road to socialism in Chile. "Respect for others, tolerance for others, is one of the most important sources of our cultural wealth", he said. Violence has in the past always come from the ruling classes:

> "The powerful were always the ones who unleashed the violence, shed the blood of Chileans and blocked the normal progress of the country. . . .
>
> "The persecution of trade unions, students, intellectuals and workers' parties is the violent reply of those who are defending their privileges".

[1] An English translation of the complete speech is published in the English edition of the Cuban *Gramma* of November 15, 1970.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The masses", he continued, "in their struggle to overcome the capitalist system, which exploits them, are arriving at the Presidency of the Republic, united in Peoples Unity, and in what constitutes the most extraordinary demonstration in our history, a recognition of the will of the majority". This has been made possible, he explained by the particular evolution of institutions in the context of the structures of Chile:

> "Chile has just provided an indication of its political development, which is completely unprecedented anywhere in the world, making it possible for an anti-capitalist movement to take power by virtue of the free exercise of the rights of all citizens. It takes power to guide the country towards a new, more humane society, one whose final goals are the nationalisation of economic activity, the progressive socialisation of the means of production and the end of class divisions".

The Chilean people are proud, he explained, "of having made the political road prevail over the violent one:

> "From the bottom of our hearts, we Chileans reject fratricidal struggle—but without ever giving up the defence of the rights of the people. Our coat of arms says "By reason or by force", but it puts reason first".

PEOPLE'S POWER

People's power will mean, Dr. Allende continued, that the Chilean people will do away with the pillars on which the minorities have found support—those minorities that always condemned our nation to underdevelopment:

> "We will do away with the monopolies, through which a handful of families control the economy. We will put an end to a fiscal system that serves those who seek lucre, a system which has always borne down hard on the people and touched but lightly on the rich, a system which has concentrated the nation's savings in the hands of the bankers in their greed for amassing greater riches. We will nationalise money-lending and place it at the service of the prosperity of Chile and the people.
>
> "We will put an end to the latifundia which condemns thousands of peasants to subjugation and poverty and keep the nation from getting from the land all the foodstuffs we need. A true agrarian reform will make it possible to do just what we are saying—feed the people. We will call a halt to the ever more massive process of denationalisation of our industries and sources of work, a process which subjects us to foreign exploitation. We will reclaim Chile's basic wealth. We are going to reclaim the large copper, coal, iron and nitrate mines for the people".

Dr. Allende, towards the end of his speech, touched on profound questions of democracy in the new Chile:

> "Our path will be that built on the basis of our experience; the path legitimised by the people in the elections, the path contained in the programme of People's Unity; the path towards socialism through democracy, pluralism and freedom".

Chile he said:

> "has the unique virtue of having the social and political institutions necessary for carrying out the transition from backwardness and dependence to development and autonomy along the socialist path.
>
> "People's Unity is, constitutionally, the exponent of such a reality. Let no one be deceived; the theoreticians of Marxism have never pretended, nor has history shown, that a single party is a prerequisite in the process of transition towards socialism.
>
> "Social circumstances and political vicissitudes—both internal and international—may lead to this situation. Civil war, when imposed upon the people as the only way towards emancipation, leads to political rigorousness; foreign intervention, its frenzy for maintaining domination at all costs, makes the exercise of power authoritarian; and poverty and generalised backwardness make it difficult for political institutions to act dynamically and the people's organisations to grow stronger.
>
> "To the extent that such situations do or do not arise in Chile, so will our country, on the basis of its traditions, organise and create the mechanisms that, within the pluralism supported by the great majorities, will make possible the radical transformation of our political system.
>
> "*This is the great legacy of our history. It is also a most generous promise for our future. It is up to us to see to it that it does, someday, become a reality*".

CHILEAN COMMUNIST PARTY

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Chilean Communist Party met on September 14-15, last year, to discuss the new situation in the country, following the electoral victory on September 4 of the Popular Unity candidate, Dr. Allende. In an interview with *Pravda* on September 20, Luis Corvalan, the General Secretary of the Communist Party, spoke of the discussions at that meeting. Asked what were the lessons to be drawn from this victory, he replied:

> "For us, Chilean Communists, the main conclusion flowing from this victory is connected with the vital importance of the unity of all the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchical forces in the country. We are far from believing that a victory such as was achieved by the people of this country could be easily repeated in any other part of the continent, although the possibility should not be ruled out.
>
> "In other words, we believe that instead of rushing to conclude that now, following the victory scored by the people of Chile, the path of elections has shaped into some sort of model which could be mechanically copied by all Latin American countries, we should conclude that the unity and mobilisation of the people, the anti-imperialist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and anti-feudal democratic forces and primarily the unity of the proletariat, unity of the working people, is the most valuable aspect of Chile's experience".

It is this unity, he continued, and, in the case of Chile, the mutual understanding between the Communists and Socialists, that "is the basis for the advance of the liberation struggle".

Luis Corvalan was also asked for his estimation of the role of the Chilean Communist Party in the long struggle for people's unity. Modestly, he replied that, as General Secretary of the Party, it was not really for him to say. He quoted the message sent by Dr. Allende to the Chilean Party's Plenum conveying his "gratitude for the loyalty and dedication displayed by the entire Communist Party, from its leadership to local party organisations, in the struggle for the victory of the Popular Unity". And he concluded:

"As concerns us, Chilean Communists, I can say only that, over a period of scores of years, we have zealously and with determination worked for a united front, for the unity of the workers and all the people's forces. This struggle has been waged for more than 30 years and we have had many successes and also setbacks. Naturally, in this struggle we have gained much experience, making it possible successfully to implement a policy of unity of the national forces, drafted by our Party. This was not an easy struggle. In order to unite the people's democratic forces it was necessary to overcome many obstacles, a great deal of resistance, to fight obvious and often concealed enemies, to engage in polemics with the incorrect stands taken by certain sincere elements.

"In conclusion I should like to point out that the victory of the Chilean people does not belong to the Communists alone; it is also the victory of other national forces, of all the Popular Unity parties. Some did more, others less. This is only to be expected. Some took part in the common struggle from the very inception of the movement, others joined at a later period, deciding to take the common path, forgetting differences and discarding sectarian views. They helped in one way or another to strengthen the unity which made our common victory possible".

THE FIRST DECREES OF SOVIET POWER

During the first nine months following the October Revolution of 1917, more than 950 decrees and other enactments are known to have been issued by the supreme bodies of Soviet Power—the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars. They range from the first Acts proclaiming and affirming the rule of the workers and poorest peasants of Russia to the first Soviet Constitution.

We very much welcome the publication by *Lawrence and Wishart* (for the first time in English) of a selection of these decrees and enactments.[2]

They are of absorbing interest. They are perhaps the most faithful record of the creation, step by step, of the original state and legal framework of the revolutionary power of the Soviets.

The collection opens with the Appeal "To the Citizens of Russia" of the Petrograd Military Revolutionary Committee of November 7 (October 25), 1917:

"The provisional Government has been deposed. State power has passed into the hands of the organ of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies—the Military Revolutionary Committee, which heads the Petrograd proletariat and the garrison.

"The cause for which the people have fought, namely the immediate offer of a democratic peace, the abolition of landed proprietorship, workers' control over production, and the establishment of Soviet power—this cause has been secured".

It includes such important documents as the *Decree on Peace* and the *Decree on Land,* both of November 8 (October 26), 1917, the *Declaration of Rights*, and various decrees on nationalisation, workers' control, the organisation of the Red Army with enactments on such subjects as marriage and divorce, education, unemployment insurance, the health services, and the protection of art and national monuments. It closes with the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federation, adopted on July 10, 1918.

Many were those who participated in the discussion and formulation of these early decrees. Lenin, as Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, played a very important part. A. V. Lunacharsky (who was then People's Commissar for Education) has vividly described the atmosphere at the sittings of the Council:

"Things hummed in *Sovnarkom* under Lenin. A definite pattern of procedure was established: extreme stringency in allotting time to speakers, whether our own or *rapporteurs* from outside. Everyone who took the floor had to be very concise and matter-of-fact. A kind of condensed atmosphere prevailed in *Sovnarkom;* time seemed to have thickened, when so many facts, ideas and decisions were packed into every minute. And yet there was not the faintest smack of officialdom, not a trace of playing at self-importance, not even of the strain of people doing back-breaking work".

[2] *First Decrees of Soviet Power*, compiled and with an introduction by Yuri Akhapkin, Lawrence & Wishart, £3.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The documents published in this collection are, indeed, official documents, the first official documents of the new Soviet state, but they are alive, with the breath of the struggle and move the reader today with the revolutionary spirit that moved Lenin and the pioneers of the October Revolution.

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union regards the development of all aspects of the work of Soviets—the plenipotentiary governing bodies of the people—as the general line in further strengthening the Soviet people's state", stated Mikhail Suslov, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, on November 26 last year.

He was speaking at a Conference of Chairmen of rural Soviets of the Russian Federation, who were discussing ways of improving their work. There were one and a half million elected representatives, he pointed out, active on more than 44,000 rural Soviets and some 1,700,000 activists also taking part in the work of their commissions.

An important factor in further improving the work of the local Soviets, he declared, was the considerable extension of their rights laid down in the new laws adopted throughout the USSR:

> "And when it is now reported that this year (1969) our country has raised the biggest harvest in the history of our agriculture . . . we know that no little credit for this goes to the local government bodies in the villages and to the Deputies of the ural Soviets".

Mikhail Suslov stressed particularly the importance of the work of the Soviets in controlling the observance of collective farm rules:

> "The adoption of new rules by collective farms helps further to develop and strengthen socialist democracy in the countryside, and stimulates the farmers' interest and activity in social production.
>
> "Rural and village Soviets should stand guard over the collective farm rules and combat the slightest infractions of the principles of collective farm democracy".

We cannot overlook he continued, violations of the collective farm rules, and Soviet legislation concerning the privately-owned subsidiary husbandries of collective farm workers and employees:

> "Too little is being done to see that collective farmers and workers living in rural districts have cattle and poultry in their private possession.
>
> "Our line in this matter is clear-cut and definite. It consists in a correct combination of the interests of the social economy and the state with the personal interests of the population".

He called the attention of the Conference to the importance of the role of the Soviets in the observance of socialist legality:

> "Rural Soviets are called upon to stand guard over the strict observance of Soviet legislation in all spheres of state and production activities and in the everyday life of the working people".

THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Much is known about the International Working Men's Association—the 1st International (1864-1872) and its successors—the Second and Third Internationals. But not nearly enough is known about the first revolutionary Communist organisation, in the establishment and work of which Marx and Engels played a leading part, namely, the Communist League (1847-1852) and for which they wrote the first, now classic programme of revolutionary socialism—*The Communist Manifesto.*

Those who can read German now have the benefit of a new and most important contribution both to Marxist historiography and to the history of this early, pioneer, revolutionary Socialist party.[3]

This first volume of a two-volume work on the Communist League is a monumental book in every sense of the word. The product of collaboration between the Institutes of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, it is marked by the highest standards of Marxist scholarship. It contains nearly 1,200 pages of extracts from articles, books, speeches, lectures, from circulars, statements and Minutes of the League itself and from letters from and to leading figures in the Movement; especially between Marx and Engels, as well as facsimile reproductions of pages of writing by Marx and Engels,[4] photographs, and a most comprehensive Introduction.

Of special interest to English readers are letters from the famous Chartist leader, George Julian Harney, one of them to Engels (March 30, 1846).

[3] *Der Bund der Kommunisten: Dokumente und Materialien* Band I—Dietz Verlag. Berlin. GDR.

[4] Some readers may comfort themselves by observing that Marx's letters seem somewhat illegibly and untidily written.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The nearly 400 extracts are arranged in four chapters, each devoted to a key stage in the history of the League—(1) The foundation of the League of the Just; (2) Marx and Engels and the struggle for a proletarian party; (3) The foundation of the Communist League; (4) The Communist League in the Revolution of 1848-1849.

The period covered by this volume—the early 1830's to 1849—was a momentous one. In Britain it saw the rise, stormy advance and decline of the first mass political movement of the working class—Chartism. In Germany it marked the advance from the League of Outlaws (*Bund der Geachteten*), a conspiratorial, petty-bourgeois democratic organisation formed mainly by German artisans living in Paris in 1834, to the League of the Just (*Bund der Gerechten*) which split off from the League of Outlaws in 1838 and became the Communist League (*Bund der Kommunisten*) in 1847.

This transition is embodied in the change from the slogan of the League of the Just—"All men are brothers"—to that of the Communist League—"Workers of all Lands Unite".

MARX AND ENGELS IN THE LEAGUE

The decisive factors contributing to this change were the theoretical and practical activity of Marx and Engels in the movement from 1844 onwards and the role played by the London organisation of the League of the Just.

Once their scientific Socialist views had matured and been expressed in such works as—*The German Ideology, Conditions of the English Working Class in* 1844, etc. Marx and Engels began to work actively to win the League and similar bodies to accept them.

They founded the Communist Corresponding Society in Brussels early in 1846. Through this they began to establish contact with the leaders of progressive, democratic and working class organisations, especially with the leaders of the Chartists and of the Fraternal Democrats (established in 1845). They joined the League of the Just early in 1847 at the special invitation of its leading committee then centred in London.

They participated actively in the two Congresses of the League held in June and December 1847. The June congress transformed the League of the Just into the Communist League and later on Marx and Engels were instructed to prepare a draft programme or manifesto for the League. This became the immortal *Communist Manifesto.*

The revolution of 1848 in which members and organisations of the Communist League played an active part, its defeat in 1849, the consequent advance of reaction, the suppression of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* the Communist daily edited by Marx, the arrest and imprisonment of many of its writers and leading members of the Communist League between the end of 1849 and 1850, weakened the organisation enormously. It was therefore decided to disband the League in 1852.

The documents reproduced in this volume put flesh and blood on all these stirring events. It is greatly to be hoped that an English translation will be prepared.

Meanwhile we are reproducing as a document in this issue a remarkable statement of Communist views, first drafted by Engels (then 27 years old) and adopted at the foundation Congress of the Communist League in June 1847, which is called "Draft of a Communist Credo" and foreshadows many of the ideas elaborated much more fully and profoundly in the *Communist Manifesto.*

CENTENARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE

Next year we will be celebrating the centenary of the Paris Commune, and there can be few centenaries of such significance to the international working class, socialist and communist movement.

The March 1971 issue of *Marxism Today* will be a special issue on the Commune which we are preparing with the help of our colleagues of *La Nouvelle Critique* in Paris, who themselves have produced a special issue on the Commune, two of the articles of which will be included in the March *Marxism Today*.

We indicate on p.22 the contents of our special issue, and we would ask readers who wish to order extra copies to do so now. Any of the advertised articles that, for lack of space, cannot be published in the March issue will be in the issues that follow.

We shall write in next month's Editorial Comments on some recent and forthcoming books on the Paris Commune.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Strategy of Socialist Revolution in Britain

Bert Pearce

The British Road to Socialism, the programme of the Communist Party of Great Britain was first published twenty years ago, in January 1951. To-day its basic ideas are more relevant, are being more widely considered, and are more urgently needed than at any time in those twenty years.

It is significant how rapidly the militant left movement has developed since the Tory victory. In the election in June the Communist candidates, putting forward a comprehensive alternative policy both to the Tories and to Right Wing Labour, based upon an all out struggle against monopoly rule, a total rejection of incomes policies, wage restraint and legal attacks on the Trade Unions, got generally small votes. Of course in assessing the election results the whole complex of the electoral system, Labour unity, control of mass media and financial resources, has to be taken into account.

But now we have not only the powerful rise of mass resistance to Tory attacks on wages, shown in the determined strike movements of council workers, miners and many other sections, but along with this, stimulating and strengthening it, the big move towards militancy and left policies in the whole movement, the biggest and most decisive Unions, the TUC itself and the Labour Party Conference. Within four months of the General Election we have all these bodies totally rejecting incomes policies, and anti-Union legislation and endorsing varying degrees of mass action to defeat them.

The huge response to the Conference in Defence of Trade Union Rights on November 14th, and the strike movement on December 8th show the extent to which the new militant policies of major trade unions, combined with the initiative of the rank and file, are enabling the workers to develop their power and to use it. Of course the roots of this new consciousness and solidarity in action go back before the General Election. It was in the long and stubborn struggle to unite the left forces, when right-wing domination of big unions seemed unshakeable, when anti-communist and anti-militant bans were ruthlessly used, and when the right-wing theories of wage restraint still commanded Conference majorities, that the basis of to-day's movement was laid. The patient advancement of an alternative policy of broad demands acceptable to all on the left, the refusal to give up the fight for trade union democracy and to retreat into sectarian isolation, the building of confidence in genuine relationships of left-communist co-operation—these were the lines which led to the decisive defeat of the Labour Government's *In Place of Strife* policy, and now to the massive challenge to the Tory Government's whole programme.

It is all the more important to remember that these lines of work are the expression of the basic ideas of the *British Road to Socialism*, the strategy whose practical application has been hammered out in successive Congresses of the Communist Party.

If the clarity and direction provided by the *British Road to Socialism* have been important in developing the present stage of united struggle, it is clear that they will be of even greater significance in successfully solving the decisive political problems which it must face.

Where Do We Go from Here?

The Tory MPs, bankers and businessmen calling for a confrontation, a showdown now, are not concerned simply to break certain wage demands. They understand that at the back of the new militancy on wages is the growing understanding that our economic and social demands cannot be satisfied within the limits of the present system.

If this arouses panic in a Lord Robens or a Carr, it also raises directly and urgently the question for the Left movement—where do we go from here—not in each individual wage struggle, but in the creation of a united political movement, with a coherent strategy to change the system? How can we indeed change not just the label on the Government, but the actual class holding power?

This of course is the fundamental problem facing the working class as soon as it begins to organise itself as an independent force. For over a century and a half, as trade unionists, Chartists, socialists our movement has been grappling with it. Fifty years ago, as Reuben Falber puts it in an important article in *Comment* (Oct. 31st, 1970):

> "The foundation of the Communist Party united the militant Marxist forces within the Labour

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Movement and provided them with an organisation to bring a socialist perspective to the working class and its allies, to link the daily struggles with the goal of socialism."

But to apply Marxist theory adequately to British conditions, to work out a strategy for socialist revolution here, which would be effective because it would be comprehensible to the working class movement and working people generally, in terms of their own experience, was a long and difficult task. The 50th Anniversary number of *Marxism Today* describes the process vividly, carried out as it was in the stormiest conditions, by a new party which from its birth was plunged into mass political struggles, never retired from them to become an academic sect, but drew its thinking from all the efforts, defeats and achievements, national and international of the working class movement.

The International Movement

Experimentation and mistakes were inevitable. It was the October Revolution, emerging out of the horror of the first world war, to shatter the system of world capitalism, and demonstrate that the workers could take power, could build a new socialist system, that launched the new liberating concepts of Marx and Lenin round the globe.

The new Soviet state, the first breakthrough, its survival against all odds, and then the fantastic economic, social, scientific and military achievements with which it astonished the world, dramatically symbolised and verified the profound theoretical leap which Lenin and his fellow Bolsheviks had made. Small wonder if the new Marxist parties, digesting the revolutionary new analysis of Leninism, should take over too mechanically, along with the great, fundamental lessons of the Socialist Revolution, some of its experiences and methods which have later been found to be peculiar to its own historical conditions, and not of general application, or even mistakes which the Soviet comrades have themselves been able to reveal and re-assess.

The proper weighing up of all these features was made more difficult by the very success and world significance of the Soviet Union, soaring to a leading place amongst the great powers, taking the central part in the ferocious struggle to destroy fascism, changing the whole balance of world forces and thus opening up the period of tempestuous colonial liberation, new socialist regimes from Berlin to Peking; new national regimes out of the ruins of colonialism in every continent.

Additional complication was added by the effects on international working class theory of the very complex distortions of Soviet democracy summed up as "the cult of the individual". One of the tendencies of this period was to encourage an unquestioning acceptance of aspects of Soviet structure, policy and practice as fundamental absolutes of Marxism which are now seen not to be so.

The process of correction, historical re-assessment and new thinking, especially opened up by the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956 has undoubtedly led to a strengthening of the movement, and given an impetus to new creative Marxist thinking of historic importance for the future. While the Soviet party and people and all the socialist countries, move along their own roads to correct the effects of past errors, and to find new ways to develop their socialist democracy and economic growth, every party has been stimulated to re-examine its own national experience and programme.

This period has also been one in which the sharpest differences in the international communist movement have occurred, demanding, not only new thinking on the issues involved, but also an essential defence of the most fundamental principles of Marxism and of a Marxist party, which enemies from both right and left felt they had an opportunity to attack.

Looking at these years now one can feel that the fierce controversies on some international issues, which fundamentally underline for us the vital importance of the *British Road*, did in fact, for a time, divert the attention of much of our party from the relevance of our programme to the critical developments in British politics. Had the powerful ideas of the *British Road* been more deeply grasped, both the Party and the Left would have been better equipped to cope with international events and with the crucial problems facing the working class movement here.

An Overall Strategy

We must all share responsibility perhaps for the fact that the theoretical basis of the programme was often only superficially treated in many discussions. All too many comrades still treat it as a sort of electoral programme, even a retreat to a supposedly easy, if unlikely, parliamentary road, designed to win votes!

With such a view the essential value of the programme, its historic purpose, was often passed over. It is worth reminding ourselves now:

> *Firstly*, that it was already in 1949-50 that the Communist Party's Executive Committee turned its attention to the need for a clear statement of revolutionary strategy in British terms. It arose out of the whole experience of the party, the new balance of forces in the post-war world following the great struggles of the thirties,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the popular front and the anti-fascist war. As adopted, debated, amended (and no doubt it will be again) by successive Congresses, it represents above all the fruit of the long practical combination of Marxism with the experience of the British working class, from the days of Marx and Engels, through the impact of the world war and Russian Revolution and the 50 years of the Communist Party. It is the essential thinking of the most consistent working class leadership in Britain.

Secondly, after twenty years, it holds the field as the only coherent strategy for socialist revolution in Britain. It has received the tribute of silence from most of the establishment commentators and politicians. The masses of paper-back Marxist reprints include little or no reference even to the existence of a programme for revolution in Britain. Right-wing leaders who sneer at the Party are afraid to popularise its programme by so much as a mention. Snipers from the ultra-left studiously fail to provide a more revolutionary alternative. Presumably they want us to return to a theoretical vacuum, filled with revolutionary phrases of the sort which Lenin condemned as "slogans repeated without regard to the objective conditions . . . to the situation as it is."

Thirdly, today, life is confronting us again in sharper form with the crisis of the working class movement which the *British Road* was designed to meet. What is demanded from us today is precisely what the *British Road* contains—a road from present struggles to the conquest of power; an assessment of capitalist state power and how they maintain it; the forces which can overcome it; a programme for the revolutionary transformation of Parliament and the state machine; not an electoral manifesto, but an overall strategy combining industrial, electoral, social, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggles for the essential objective of changing class power.

The key significance of the *British Road* today is well argued by John Gollan in his latest pamphlet —*What is the Socialist Way Forward?*:

> "We have got to realise the limits of militancy in the economic struggle, and even on the wider social and foreign policy issues . . . as society remains capitalist society, new dangers, new social problems arise . . . Increasingly the issue of wages, trade union freedom, racialism, war and peace, the defence of the social services, is bound up with the general political struggle, the nature of government policy at home and abroad, state intervention and the like. Increasingly it is the capitalist system which must be challenged.
>
> Many young people and students approach the matter from the opposite angle. They want to bring down the system, but fail to grasp the need for immediate and more limited measures, the need to bring the masses of the people into these struggles, as the first step to involving them in the wider struggles and out of that to raise their socialist consciousness. We have the ultra-left arguments which dismiss Parliament and 'traditional politics' and talk about political power, without spelling out the ways, means, stages and forces for getting to political power . . . The political struggle must be organised. For this the political party is the instrument, with organisation, ideology and programme."

That this puts in a nutshell the challenge facing all who want to see the present Left movement develop into a decisive political force, few would deny. It points directly to the twin tasks which most of all can carry British politics to a new turning point.

Role of the Communist Party

The building of a very much bigger and more influential Communist Party will speed the spread of fundamental socialist ideas amongst the decisive sections of the people.

Many more people on the Left are beginning to realise this today. But too few, inside and outside the Communist Party, searching ardently for the key to building the party more quickly, grasp the essential condition which Lenin so urgently stressed in the days when building the party was the hard, uphill task for him too—"*Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement*".

It is in the battle to take the ideas of the British Road to Socialism *to all those most active, and most deep-thinking in the course of the present struggles that we can open their minds to the way ahead, and to the vital need for the Communist Party which is charting the way.*

This is what compels us now to make a fresh study of the basic ideas of our programme. To allow apathetic neglect of theory to leave the present mass movement imprisoned by capitalist and right-wing ideas would be to fail in the central purpose of a revolutionary party. To allow ultra-left criticism to sow confusion and lack of confidence unanswered; or to think that a scientific revolutionary strategy will just burst into people's minds on a picket line or a mass demonstration, would be to repeat some of the oldest utopian and anarchist mistakes of the movement. Maybe some young people have to make such mistakes again to learn from them. The danger of some of the ultra-left organisations today is that they crystallise these mistakes of "left-wing childishness" into a rigid barrier of dogma, behind which young comrades can decay into a distorted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sectarianism, or a cynical drop-out's dream world.

The Communist Party, embodying its own fifty years, and the whole century and more of Marxist experience, should never forget that it is its special duty to clearly understand the line of march, and in the various stages of the struggle always to represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

The greatest mistake we could make today would be to underestimate the extent to which the mass struggles are stimulating interest in the basic solutions to the chaos of the present system. Out of the confusion of right-wing theorising, and its dismal failure in practice, people want more than socialist slogans and phrases. They want an analysis of our society, a definition of the socialist alternative and the forces which can drive towards it. A study of the *British Road to Socialism* shows how effectively it meets this need.

What are some of its main concepts?

The Root Cause of our Crisis is Capitalism Itself

This is one of those deceptively simple statements which grow in importance as the working class struggle develops. Repeated parrot-like it can become a sectarian platitude. Properly linked and argued it is the first basic element in raising political consciousness, giving a common purpose to the torrent of sectional struggles.

For this reason the ruling class spends so much time to provide a multitude of alternative theories to explain the crisis which can no longer be hidden. War, wages, poverty, racialism, all call into question the meaning of a society which seems unable to solve them. Anthropology, philosophy, social psychology, religion—all are called into service to point in any direction they like, except towards the horrible, glaring spectre of class struggle.

The council workers 50/- and the miners' £3 filled the papers with profound warnings about the insoluble inflation which would plunge our whole society into catastrophe. The Prime Minister's reply was a sick sermon on the subject of freedom which left the financial commentators groping for something to say. They understood all too well that the so-called new policy of a free economy, without state interference, was in reality a declaration of open and unbridled class war. The state says to the great monopolies—public and private—go ahead and bash wages down. We won't interfere, except to give you a battle-axe and all the financial backing you need; and of course we'll tie the trade unions' hands behind their backs, and if they kick out at you, we'll incite the crowd to lynch'em because they are against the public interest.

In seven pages (page 8 to 15 of the 3rd edition, October, 1968) the *British Road* gives a brilliantly simple but fundamental analysis of modern British capitalism, its economic crisis, its imperialist basis, its development into State Monopoly Capitalism and the threat this poses even to the democratic process and rights we have gained in many years of struggle. These pages alone would repay thoughtful reading and re-reading by all who are engaged in the debates over what kind of understanding can really unite the Left for its essential purpose today.

The analysis leads directly to the strategic heart of our programme, the proposition that the very dominance of the super-trusts creates the possibilities of isolating them, of mobilising against them the overwhelming majority of the people, of all, from whatever section of society, whose interests are to some degree menaced by the monopolies and their control of the state.

This is the potential power for social change, which the working class, led by a united Left movement, could bring to bear. To achieve this should be the guiding line of Left policy and organisation.

Some critics seem to fear that in highlighting the role of the super-monopolies we are somehow making an unreal distinction and perhaps glossing over the fact that it is the whole capitalist class, and its state and system which is our enemy. Any reading of the *British Road* should dispose of this fear. From the first page to the last the out-dated capitalist system is placed historically and entirely up against the socialist society which must replace it.

The Giant Firms

Again it was Lenin who reminded us that, from the long-term historical point of view, differences between bourgeois politicians, or sections of the capitalist class, might have little significance, but from the point of view of the mass struggle now, the disposition of forces and the direction of our strategy, such differences could be of vital importance.

If in Lenin's time it was important for the working class to study and make use of such differences, how much more important today, when the growth of the super-corporation and its role in international capitalism is forcing itself on the attention of every political and economic commentator.

The very existence of these giant firms, and their constant and often catastrophic effects on the lives of thousands of people, through their mergers, and wholesale re-organisations and closures, raise the issues of public ownership and control with tremendous force. They demonstrate that old free enterprise capitalism (the beloved legend) really *has* gone; that, in an economic sense, they are already ripe for socialism; and more than that, that the choice is no longer between socialism and the continuation of a supposed nation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free capitalist units. The alternative to socialist nationalisation now is the taking over of entire, basic British industries by foreign or internationally owned monopolies, as is taking place before our eyes in motors, chemicals, drugs, oil, petro-chemicals, automatic business machines, computers and so on.

The firm core, and the greatest mass strength of any anti-capitalist and anti-monopoly alliance in Britain, is obviously the working class. It is not only by its class position, the most consistent socialist force, the most solidly organised by its industrial basis, the most experienced through its history of class organisation and struggle, it is also the great majority in numbers. But against its great potential in numbers and organisation is ranged the enormous wealth and economic power of the oldest capitalist class in the world, most deeply entrenched in the state apparatus and in the whole ramification of the social structure, education system and mass media.

Modern Monopoly Capitalism

Faced with the problem, how to expose such an enemy, how to weaken its hold over the people generally, the working class movement would be foolish to ignore the outstanding new features which modern monopoly capitalism introduces:

—its threat to the national interests and sovereignty even of its own capitalist country can arouse and antagonise all those (even some capitalist sections) who are concerned with our national independence (which they may identify with their own sectional survival also.)

—by its very concentration of power in fewer hands it creates the possibility of "building a broad popular alliance around the leadership of the working class, fighting every aspect of the policies of the monopolies; to develop a wide movement for peace, democracy and improvement of living standards, and for a democratic programme that leads in the direction of socialism".

(*BRS*, p. 28)

—This alliance is spelled out as embracing all working people. Thus workers in factories, offices, professions, working farmers, producers and consumers, owner-occupiers and tenants, housewives, young people, students, pensioners, workers in the peace movement and those active in defence of democracy—all those whose lives are immediately affected by policies framed to perpetuate and uphold monopoly capitalism, can be united in struggle.

(*BRS*, p. 28)

—the nature of monopoly capitalism tends towards more authoritarian methods of rule. Even in Britain, with the long heritage of relatively stable democratic institutions and its supposedly impartial and non-interfering state, the post-war period has seen the increased use of the state in a direct and open way to serve the monopolies through subsidies, state reorganisation of industries, including nationalisation, foreign and fiscal policies, all carried out through a massive extension of the state machinery to integrate the leading personnel of government administration, the banks and monopoly industry as never before. (See for example Gollan's account of the process under the Labour Government in *Socialism in the Sixties.*)

—These developments, and the continuous Government attacks on trade union rights, civil liberties and local authority powers, make possible a much sharper exposure of the class nature of the state today, and the rallying of very wide movements to defend and extend our democratic rights against the encroachments of the monopolies and their persistent probing towards some form of corporate state (British model of course.)

Broad Alliance

Some comrades have queried whether the list of people who could be drawn into struggle against the monopolies corresponds to a Marxist analysis of class forces, and is it therefore really a basis for an alliance of classes in the struggle for socialism.

Of course the list is not a definition of separate class forces. It includes, for instance, working class people in several different capacities—owner occupiers, housewives, tenants, producers and consumers—as well as middle strata people such as the professions, and working farmers. The point is to show the varied interests in which the great majority of the British people do in fact find themselves in conflict with the monopolies, in almost every aspect of their lives.

It is in the course of mass struggle, says the programme, that:

> "understanding can be built up of the interconnection of different aspects of monopoly policy, and the fundamental issues involved (p. 29) . . . the programme which we put forward (*The Fields of Struggle*, p. 30 to p. 46) unites the interests of the working class with those of virtually all sections of the people outside big business . . . In the course of the struggle new political alignments will be created and the people's confidence will be generated in their own ability to transform the whole social system. As the battle sharpens and the power of big business is challenged, experience and knowledge will more and more show the logical need to end the present capitalist system and to build a new socialist society."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What are the guarantees that such a broad alliance will in fact lead towards socialism, and sustain the critical battles for a government actually to operate socialist measures?

First—that the working class is really the numerical, political and organisational driving force.

Second—that the basic interests of the overwhelming majority of people are in fact opposed to the monopolies.

Third—that to the extent the working class is united by bold leadership, standing squarely for the interests of all workers by hand and brain, giving a militant and determined example, and clearly putting forward the case for Socialism as the only alternative—then it will obviously attract the support of large numbers of those whose sectional interests it has championed, and will at least neutralise many more whose support for the monopolies and for the Tory party has been undermined.

Making all allowances for differences in the social background, the breadth of the Left alliance which supported Allende's victorious election in Chile, and the reception of that election in the country, offers an interesting example of the political climate which a powerful revolutionary movement pursuing a broad policy can create.

Socialism the Solution

This is the central message of the whole programme, and it is everywhere boldly stated. From page 5: "The working people will have to make a revolutionary change, end capitalism and build a socialist society"; to page 16: "There is no middle way. The only path of advance is towards socialism." and the final conclusion on page 69, putting the choice to the people of Britain as either continued state monopoly capitalism or taking the road to socialism.

Nor is it unclear what is meant. The section "Socialism the Solution" on page 16 opens its description with: "The economic basis of socialism is public ownership of all important means of production, distribution and exchange. Politically it is power in the hands of the working people."

But what some dogmatic comrades, seeking for familiar jargon, may fail to appreciate is how much the whole programme is itself a profound and detailed definition of socialism. In the period of confusion, and distortion of basic socialist ideas which has accompanied the Labour Governments, and their "Twentieth Century Fabians", "New Thinkers" and the like, the importance of such a clear and trenchant restatement of what socialism really means is tremendous. To express again the essential Marxist analysis, enriched by the exceptional experience of world wide revolutionary movements in the past twenty-five years, and to do it in the language and applied to the actual political conditions and consciousness of the British working class movement, is a major part of the programme's contribution to the shaping of the movement for its coming victory.

There is hardly a page which does not help to illustrate the essential class nature of all our political and social problems, but in the ten pages—pp. 50 to 60—is concentrated not only a classical definition of the basic tasks of a socialist government, but an account of what these measures would mean to the liberties and social lives of the people. Page 51 summarises:

> "socialist nationalisation of all monopolies and and other large scale concerns in productive industry and distribution, of the banks, and insurance companies, and control of foreign trade and overseas relations;
> initiation of socialist planning to cover the economy as a whole, in order to improve working and living conditions . . .
> consolidation of political power by ensuring that those in commanding positions in the armed forces, police, the civil services and diplomatic service, are loyal to the socialist government;
> practical extension of democratic control over the press and broadcasting, the conduct of elections and the administration of the law;
> establishment of new relations with developing nations and with the socialist countries . . ."

Socialist Democracy

In the following pages this economic, social and foreign policy is spelled out in some detail. Perhaps of greatest interest—and most explosive effect in shattering the bourgeois press caricatures of Communism—is the outline of Socialist Democracy on pages 52-54. We can naturally expect all the organs of capitalist ideas to exploit to the utmost every set-back, and every error into which their historical circumstances may have forced the first socialist countries in their long and complicated struggle. Equally naturally we will not allow this to divert our understanding of the dominating role of the socialist world for world peace, and for the opening up of world-wide liberation. It is on the basis of their pioneering that we are able today to debate and work for new roads to socialism.

It is also our responsibility to note that few things would assist the socialist countries in their efforts to advance their socialist democracy and their economic systems, as much as decisive advances (so long delayed) in the social transformation of the major capitalist countries.

All the more reason for us to make widely known and understood the expansion of democracy which we envisage in a socialist Britain, and which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the international experiences lead us to understand as the essence of socialism, applied to our conditions.

> "A socialist government requires a socialist state machine. Without this the political power of the people expressed in the democratic decision of the electoral majority cannot be effective, nor can socialism be built . . . The aim is to make the socialist state machinery the servant of the people" (p. 53).
>
> "When a socialist majority in parliament is won it will need the support of the mass movement outside parliament to uphold the decisions it has taken in Parliament. Conversely the Parliamentary decisions will give legal endorsement to popular aims and popular struggles.
>
> "The strength of the mass movement will be felt in Parliament, and the strength of the socialist movement within Parliament will strengthen the movement outside . . . In this way, by political action, using our democratic rights to transform traditional institutions Parliament can be made into the effective instrument of the people's will . . ." (p. 49).
>
> "A socialist Parliament would obviously involve new principles, as the aim would be for the control of the country's affairs to be administered by the people through their elected representatives . . ." (p. 52).
>
> "Independent of the state and retaining all their rights, they (the trade unions) would not only negotiate on all questions affecting members, but would have a leading part to play in economic planning . . . one of the main objectives attainable under socialist ownership of the key industries would be the development of industrial democracy . . . this would involve workers participation in management at all levels—in the planning of industry as a whole—in the individual factories, and departments of factories, and at workshop level." (p. 53).
>
> "Nationalised industries would form the core of a planned economy . . . their boards would be composed of workers, technicians, technologists, scientists and managers with direct experience of the industry." (p. 58).
>
> "The reorganisation of the press and other mass media, and the dissolution of the press monopolies, would ensure the expression of a variety of views, and the transmission of news without distortion for commercial ends. Newspapers and periodicals would be owned and controlled by political parties and social groups, trade unions, co-operatives and professional associations, organisations for women, youth, and those catering for particular fields of literature, art and sport." (p. 55).

These extracts give a picture of a Parliamentary democracy really transformed into an instrument of the people's will, radically different from capitalist democracy in the three essential ways:

—that the means of production, distribution and exchange are publicly owned, removing the economic power of the capitalist class and transforming the social relations of production.
—that the capitalist state machine is replaced by a socialist one.
—that the mass media are removed from capitalist ownership and come under democratic control of the people.

How Much Freedom?

All this would constitute a revolutionary extension of people's effective freedom, their power to affect their environment, their living and working conditions, to direct social wealth towards the betterment of life for all, is clear.

The *British Road* rightly emphasises what a vast fund of productive capacity and further development will be unleashed when a technologically advanced country such as Britain is freed from the restrictions of capitalist economy and neo-imperialism.

Many people frankly anxious to see great new social advance, nevertheless hold back, and ask—will it mean a loss of what personal freedom we have now? Will it mean a one-party rule that can never be shifted? Will all the law, press and civil liberties be subjected to an all-powerful state? How can we avoid the development of a dominating bureaucracy?

To these questions, which are some of the fairly major road blocks which the bourgeois and right wing propagandists put in our way, the *British Road* gives two powerful answers.

The first is in its explicit statements that:

> "Civil liberties, won through the centuries, would be consolidated and extended including, freedom to think, work, travel, speak, dissent, act and believe, subject only to those limitations required in any ordered and just society to protect citizens from interference and exploitation by others, and to safeguard the state . . ." (p. 54).
>
> "Democratically organised political parties, including those hostile to socialism, would have the right to maintain their organisation, publications and propaganda and to contest elections . . . Elections would give the people the opportunity to discuss and modify policy and to decide what government they wanted.
>
> A socialist government which bases its policies on popular interests and aspirations, and consults and informs the people at every stage, can be confident of retaining the popular support for its programme. Such a government sees its task both to lead and to accept the guidance of the people."

How real is the prospect of such a multi-party socialism? Those who ask might answer some other questions. How likely is it that the British working class and people, with their vast experience of organisation and democratic processes, would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

put up with anything else? Starting from our conditions, what basis should a socialist government seek other than the voluntary support of the majority of working people? Is it realistic to suppose that the day after the election of a socialist majority in Parliament, all fundamental differences of opinion amongst the working class will have disappeared, and all political parties will vanish? Or should they all be banned?

The great hypocrisy of capitalist democracy is not that it has several political parties, but that it makes sure that the effective choice is only between those dedicated to capitalism. Take away the economic, financial and state power of the ruling class, provide a truly democratic electoral system, end the millionaire-controlled press and TV and it will be the capitalist parties who will fear free elections, and perhaps seek to subvert them by force or fraud. But if they do, then the power of a socialist state, backed by the organised mass of the working class, is there to deal with illegal action.

Democratic Organisation

And this brings in the second, and deeper, guarantee that the end of capitalist rule would indeed bring in greater freedom for the ordinary people and not less.

The very process of achieving socialist power through democratic struggle, must involve, not only the key moments of mass action, demonstrations, strikes and the most varied forms of pressure needed in the campaigning for a socialist majority, and to ensure its programme afterwards. It will obviously involve a growth of working class and united organisation on a scale we can hardly imagine now. Yet the British working class has an unusually rich experience of forming such organisations whenever it needs them. Every strike builds its leadership, often both elaborate and flexible. Whether in the Councils of Action of 1919, or the General Strike of 1926, or in the various United Front and Hunger March Committees of the thirties, or the shop stewards linking up on a combine, or entire industry scale, these organisations have shown the ability to exercise decisive power quickly and effectively while drawing the mass of workers into both decision making and action.

Such bodies, growing in the mass political struggle for socialism, at least indicate the lines on which parliament, as the supreme organ of representative power will in fact be based upon; not simply the votes which elect it in a particular general election, but upon a living political movement, composed of continuously functioning working class organisations, primarily rooted in the factories, but closely linked also through the developed trades councils and local councils with every section of the people.

Here indeed the history of our own working class movement points clearly to its power of organisation, not as an alternative to the Parliamentary system, not as a vague anarchist or syndicalist alternative to taking state power, but rather as the living and readily understood form in which the people can both guarantee the power to carry out the laws of a socialist parliament, and ensure their democracy is defended against any tendency to a bureaucratic over-centralisation.

To our people today disillusioned with monopoly dominated government, and television elections; anxious for real participation yet scared stiff by the press bogeys of "communist totalitarianism", these sections of our programme carry a vital message.

Why Do Labour Governments Fail?

This very topical question, nagging away in the minds of most thinking workers today, is an essential step towards tackling the more positive issue of how the working class is going to win. If the Labour Governments of 1924 and 1929 could partially cover their abject nakedness with the fig-leaves of "only a minority in Parliament" and "the world economic slump and the MacDonald sell out", the post-war governments 1945 to 1951 and 1964 to 1966 have no such excuses.

All the more reason that the analysis and explanation of their failure must be fundamental and generalised into conclusions about the basic fallacies of right wing Labour theory and practice so that the lessons can be learned. To go beyond the specious mathematics of each election swing and counter-swing is necessary if we are ever to break out of the descending spiral of Tory-Labour-Tory, or Right-Left-Right in the Cabinet politics of the Labour Party itself.

In eight pages (pp. 18-26) the *British Road* condenses the experience of 60 years of social democracy, and of four Labour Governments into a statement whose simplicity, clarity and directness must carry conviction to any active worker, now struggling to rally the Labour Movement, against the Tory attacks,—attacks which were made possible by the failure of the Wilson Government.

> "If Labour Governments and Labour leaders accept the role of managers of capitalism; if they content themselves with restricted nationalisation controlled by a state loyal to capitalism, then inevitably monopoly is strengthened, and Labour Governments end in fiasco." (*BRS*, p. 21).

Here it is perhaps enough to recall the substantiation of this conclusion in such detailed analyses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Gollan's *Case for Socialism in the Sixties* and E. J. Hobsbawm's *Industry and Empire*. Hobsbawm vividly illustrates how at no time, even in the 1945 period, did any Labour Government even appear to see nationalisation as a key step towards the transformation of society; or even to see the public sector as a leading force in the economy, to set the pace in growth, modernisation, social responsibility and to show the superiority of socialist ownership and planning. On the contrary the role of the nationalised industries was always seen as a secondary reserve, a supplier, and occasionally perhaps an investment manipulator for a basically capitalist economy.

A tragically wasted opportunity, and one for which the British people, and others, are still paying dearly. And it stems directly from the domination in the Labour Movement of those right-wing theories which the *British Road* so incisively exposes, and counters with the fundamental alternative, the struggle for working class unity around class and socialist policies.

This basic principle, that working class unity is the key to bringing the strength of the workers (numerical and potential) into effective action to defeat capitalism and build socialism—this is what so many modern sectarians and ultra-lefts fail to grasp. Taking "unity" as a mere tactic, a proposal for some temporary alliance, or organisational agreement between the Labour Party and the Communist Party, or between the Left—Communists and progressives—they either reject it in theory as "opportunist" and remain in isolated "purity"—free from allies, opportunism and mass influence; or they reject it in practice, raising slogans and demands which make the real process of building unity impossible.

Democracy and Class Struggle

It is this understanding of the process of developing unity which is the guiding and creative essence of the *British Road to Socialism*. "Unity *begins* wherever there is common action on the immediate issue . . ." but it must develop further. . . . "Of key importance is unity in the factories and trade unions . . . unity demands common action . . . and to end every type of prohibition and ban . . . to work for unity . . . it is necessary to combat the reformist ideas spread by right wing leaders . . . for unity is needed not just against the present attacks of capitalism, on immediate issues, but also for a common strategy of struggle against monopoly and for advance in the direction of socialism".

In the final chapter of *Left Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder* Lenin reminded us that the creation of a Marxist party, the bringing of Marxist ideas to the most advanced and organised section of the working class, was a different problem requiring different methods, from that of leading the masses actually to the point of revolutionary struggle and change.

To seek out, to divine, to find in their own national and historical circumstances the strategy, policies, methods which would indeed lead their own masses into the decisive conflict with capitalism, this, he said, was now the great task facing the Communist Parties, and it was more than a matter of propaganda, or Marxist slogans.

In March 1917 he told the 7th Congress of the RCP:

> "We must accept as a fact, and take account of the fact, that the Socialist Revolution will not begin as easily in the advanced countries as in Russia. To begin a revolution without preparation in a country where capitalism is developed, where it has given a culture and a democratic organisation to everyone, would be a mistake, an absurdity."

Our experience of the past fifty years has confirmed, as so often, the depth of perception lying behind such remarks of Lenin's. British Imperialism in particular has shown its remarkable reserves both of economic and political strength, and a high degree of flexibility in using them. Forced to retreat, they do it with stubborn cunning, turning every concession to create the utmost disorientation of the working class for a further period.

Look at the span of years from Liberalism and the Lib-Lab leaders to the first Labour Government of 1924; then to 1929-31 and the switch to the "National Government" of MacDonald and Baldwin. Not till 1945 does a Labour Government appear to operate the semblance of a radical policy. Nationalisation, and the National Health and Education plans—these are carefully integrated accepted into the system, along with new policies of economic intervention and "planning" which are born as allegedly "socialist" measures yet painlessly emerge as just what the doctor ordered for a revamped state monopoly-capitalism.

Now in 1970 the new Tory Government feels its way to a further dismantling of what it hopes to be a sufficiently discredited nationalised sector of industry, and of the "welfare state".

It is inevitable that some, considering this long and tortuous struggle, should cry out for an end to "reforms" and for a turn to some "instant revolution". Anarchism, we were told long ago, is the punishment of the working class for right-wing opportunism.

But it is a mistake we should not make, today, when as Marxists we should see that, however cunning and stubborn, the long retreat of British Imperialism is nevertheless a retreat. Also as Marxists we understand that "reforms" represent different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things to the ruling class who concede them and to the working class which fights for them.

One of the central ideas of Leninism (stemming from the *Communist Manifesto's* statement that the first step is "to raise the working class to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy") is that the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism are inseparable.

The working class can only win power if at every stage of its struggle, its programme of economic and immediate demands is linked to an ever-extending programme of democratic reforms, striving to advance the effective democratic power of the people, and to isolate and limit the power of the monopolies.

It is in the advance of such demands step by step, so that their purpose and justification can be understood by the great majority of the people, and in the struggle to achieve them in a mass, revolutionary way, that the best conditions develop for raising the political consciousness and unity of the people.

Raising Political Consciousness

What is the significance of the powerful mass campaign and strike movement in defence of Trade Union rights? Based upon the defence of existing democratic rights, and living standards, it is in reality a major offensive for working class organisation and ideas. Hundreds of thousands of workers are gaining a new confidence in their strength when united for action; they are experiencing themselves the nature of the state and the mass media, and their own ability to cope with them; they are discussing the basic problems of why right-wing policies fail and what new socialist policies are needed.

The *British Road to Socialism* (p. 47) puts it:

> "The working people through the experience of struggle carried out under socialist leadership, and helped by the constant exploration of socialist ideas, will come to understand the need to win political power.
>
> "The broad popular alliance that they have established in the course of united action for a common democratic programme will give them the strength to apply the knowledge they have gained.
>
> "In the course of struggle important inroads will be made into the power of the monopolists—economic, political and social."

The essence of this approach is to use to the full all the great democratic advances already won by the people in centuries of struggle, so as to create the widest possible alliance against the monopolists who are the core of the capitalist ruling class; to inject into every democratic right a new class content, to make it a foothold for further advance, and so to impose conditions favourable for the advance to socialism, not without intense struggle, not without violent clashes, but without the capitalists being able to resort to civil war.

The possibility of such a new road to socialism, imposing our power on the ruling class, but by methods different from the armed insurrection and civil war necessary in some other countries and at other historical periods, arises both from our national and international conditions. The tremendous change in the balance of world forces, the power of the world wide socialist system, which supports Vietnam, makes possible the existence of socialist Cuba, also restricts the methods and resources which Imperialism can readily use in its own developed metropolitan countries.

But this can only open up possibilities, the use of which depends upon the full development by the working class of the democratic power available in its own special national conditions. In Britain these conditions include the centuries-old Parliamentary forms, the long growth of capitalist democracy involving the conceding of extensive working class rights, education, trade union organisation, press and propaganda, the vote, with political parties participating in parliament and local councils, and the widespread network of organised activity, through trades councils, co-operatives and scores of bodies, official and voluntary, through which the working class enters into discussion and administration of almost every field of social life.

Of course the process is two sided. To the ruling class, a form of safety valve, an involvement of the working class in processes really directed by the state. But to the working class these rights provide a very real platform on which to mobilise against capitalism the great majority of the people, in defence of those very democratic principles which British capitalism has so long boasted to be its glory and its justification.

Transformation of Parliament

The Chartists fought for the vote. Eighty years later it had been won, but Parliament remained the monopoly of bourgeois parties. The working class fought for Trade Union rights and independent political organisation. The Labour Party was formed and in half a century achieved a majority government. But the Labour Party was dominated by opportunism and surrendered to the state machine. The capitalist monopolies remained in ownership and in power.

Now let the working class take up the next stage of its struggle, to defend every inch of its present rights and powers and to use them to press for the fundamental changes it needs. This is the vital strategic concept of the *British Road*, to defend working class rights and Parliamentary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democracy against all attacks from the ruling class and at the same time develop the struggle to transform Parliament from a bourgeois institution into an effective instrument of the people's will.

Does this mean that, as some comrades have feared, we simply defend bourgeois democracy, accept the present parliamentary system as the ultimate in democratic forms? Does it mean that we subordinate the mass struggle to a formal electoralism? Does posing the aim of a Parliamentary majority condemn the revolutionary movement to defeat, beheaded by bourgeois state power, or confused and dispersed by the mass media in a bourgeois controlled election?

These are important questions. But I believe the comrades who hold on to these views are themselves failing to see the revolutionary potential of our times. They would in fact, condemn the movement to sterility by trying to cramp it within abstract formulas of revolution that are not relevant to the people's experience and perspectives of advance.

Mass and Electoral Struggle

The *British Road* presents its way forward, not as the only one possible, not as a crystal-ball look into the future, but as the most effective and beneficial, the most realistically revolutionary path ahead from where we are today. It warns correctly that the ruling class will seek to use every means including violence to halt this advance. But those leftists who can see nothing except what *the ruling class* will want to do, and whose tactical advice seems to amount to shouting "Down with bourgeois democracy—for armed struggle now and always!"—we can only urge them to reflect that such stupid adventurism would be the best guarantee that the majority of the people were never mobilised against capitalism at all, and that the ruling class indeed have it all their own way.

On the contrary, the strategy of the *British Road* is the only one which takes the economic and immediate struggles out of their narrow circle and properly links them with need for political unity, and political power. This is not a question of *either* electoral *or* mass struggle. Both must and will go hand in hand:

> "We believe that this is a perspective that can be achieved, that the working class and popular movement can, at a time of mounting class struggle in which the overwhelming majority of the people is in action, be brought to the vital challenging stage where a general election, fought on the issue of socialist change, can bring decisive results." (*BRS*, p. 50).

Only if the people's determined effort to use their democratic, electoral rights is frustrated by ruling class violence is it sensible to conceive of a mass understanding of the need to fight by other means for their rights. And experience in many countries seems to show that even then the recovery and extension of the broadest democratic rights is the basis upon which the movement is best rallied to expose and defeat the bourgeois dictatorship.

To say, as some comrades have, that it is a mistake to fight for decisive results on the electoral field, because here the workers are atomised and isolated at the ballot box, instead of united in mass action, is a defeatism which would leave the ruling class (and their right wing supporters) in undisputed possession of a very vital area of political power and propaganda. More seriously it perpetuates the fatal gulf between the great industrial power and organisational experience of the British working class, and the use of that power in the field of democratic political struggle where it can challenge the central structure and power of capitalism as a state.

The weakness of the working class in the electoral field is not due fundamentally to the system of voting (with all its distortions). It is due to the domination of social democratic ideas; the failure as yet to unite a decisive part of the working class around the ideas of Marxism. Today when a powerful (but still elementary) degree of industrial unity is growing up, the problem of projecting this into a united Left force on the political and electoral field confronts everyone seriously concerned with winning socialism.

That this is a difficult and complicated task no one disputes. But it is the essential next step, and in taking it we shall find not only difficulties, but also new possibilities for solving some of the obstacles which have blocked our way for so long. The emergence of a united left movement with a political programme for a broad alliance of democratic forces against the monopolies would transform the political prospects. Not only in Chile are electoral victories possible.

Strength of the Working Class and its Allies

The overwhelming numerical superiority of the working class in Britain, plus its unrivalled organising ability, can bring to bear in the electoral field a power capable of shattering the electoral balance so painfully maintained by the right-wing-Tory two-party system. Organised in the factories and on the housing estates, and in the local councils and on every mass issue, a Left alliance could at last undermine the mass basis of the Tory party, and build up an overwhelming preponderance of votes. In considering the experience of countries such as Italy and France, we so often weigh up their experience of fascism, or occupation, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relative strength of British Imperialism. But we should also bear in mind that compared to their problems of large scale peasant populations, the British people are composed predominantly of the working class.

This is significant not only for the forms of mass struggle from which everything must grow, but for the decisive issues of class conflict when the mass movement, either seeking a socialist majority in Parliament, or in operating that Parliament's decisions, has to defeat and replace the old state apparatus. The experience of post-war years in Britain and other countries, has given us vivid examples of the power of workers by united action, to dominate, or hold up or defy, the operations of every part of the capitalist establishment.

In the complex of modern society everything—industrial production, communications, transport, public services, press and television, even the military and police—is dependent on the operations, increasingly technical and decisive, of workers, by hand or brain. And these workers, including the so called "white-collar" sections, and the technologists and scientists, are increasingly organised, integrated with the whole working class movement, and forming an army which could powerfully resist and frustrate the efforts of the capitalist state and mass media to sabotage a people's democratic advance.

The workers' strikes, Post Office workers and Council workers demonstrations, the peace movement and some students sit-ins and occupations, have indicated lines of mass action which might be developed in support of a socialist movement. The aim of winning an electoral majority does not in any way supersede, or limit or hold back the development of the mass political struggle in every form.

Without the simultaneous growth of political consciousness and its organised mass expression, able to exert its power, and if necessary paralyse attempts at violent resistance, or capitalist sabotage, an electoral majority could not be achieved, and could not carry out its socialist programme. To take another example, the power of the organised workers in television, radio and the press would be a decisive factor in breaking the ruling class monopoly of the mass media at a critical time.

At the same time, it is the unifying of all sections of the people around a programme of democratic advance, first against the monopolies, and then for the establishment of socialism, which will enable the people to use their mass strength, and to achieve permanent results from it. Mass actions which do not unite for the ultimate purpose of changing the system, setting up a new socialist state power, will have to retreat, leaving capitalism to regain its ground.

The aim of achieving a socialist majority in Parliament to carry through a really socialist transformation of the state and of society is the unifying purpose in our conditions. Some comrades seem to find difficulty as to how we shall breach the fixed barrier between bourgeois democracy and socialist democracy. But the fixed barrier is in their minds. The fundamental question of course is that of power—the ownership and control of industry, the economy and the state.

But in the struggle for power, the people will take and use rights won under bourgeois democracy, to press demands which go further. And when they use such rights, backed by their mass action, to enforce the legal take-over of capitalist industry, and the transformation of the state, then the class content of democratic forms is indeed changed. The nature of the struggle involved and the degree of violence which the ruling class may offer in resistance will be determined most of all by the unity and determination shown by the great majority of the people to achieve this strategy of peaceful transition.

It is the presentation of this unifying strategy which is the purpose of the *British Road to Socialism*. And the key to our problems today is to make this strategy, through discussion and shared experience, the property of the decisive Left-moving sections of the working class.

In the Britain of the Seventies, the possibilities of a very broad alliance of forces against the monopolies are obvious. To what extent it is achieved, and how far it will go, depends most of all upon the clarity and determination with which the working class movement presents itself as the heart of such an alliance.

This is why I would return in conclusion to the Section 2 of the *British Road* (pp. 18-27) and urge the most thoughtful re-reading of these pages. They are full of profound ideas, which gain a new value when considered among the events of the present time.

Left-Communist unity is growing today before our eyes. It is not a matter of formal agreements or bargains. It is a matter of establishing honest and comradely co-operation in action, of developing trust and deepening understanding in discussion of our socialist objectives. It presupposes that we have common objectives.

The *British Road* states, confident that it is a continuing trend:

> "Resistance to the right wing domination of the Labour Party, both on the political wing and in the trade unions, is developing. The protest of the Labour Left deepens against policies which betray socialist principles. Former automatic votes from trade unions for right wing policies are being broken. The interest in Marxism is increasing . . .

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Here is the basis to move beyond protests against right wing policies, towards the formulation of a positive alternative policy and the waging of an effective political struggle in its support."

Today already this process is further advanced. The biggest and most significant unions are pioneering new policies and more militant forms of struggle. Does this open up a real possibility of a new future for the Labour Party and those hundreds of thousands of genuine socialists who support it?

Communist Party and Labour Party

The *British Road* answers—Yes. We do not see the Labour Party as one solid reactionary structure, condemned to be shattered into fragments by any Left struggle within it. It is the continued domination of right wing leaders, holding the movement confined within capitalist ideas, which has torn the Labour Party in endless fights between Left and Right. But the Left represent the real and ultimate interests of the working class.

> "As Communists we sincerely desire the strengthening of the left trends within the Labour Party. We believe that the struggle of the socialist forces to make it a party of action and socialism will grow, and that the growth of the Communist Party will help this development. When the Labour Party rejects reformism, moves into the attack on capitalism, ends the bans and proscriptions against the left, it will ensure itself a vital role in the building of socialism." (*BRS*, p. 24).

We see this struggle to unite all left forces, inside and outside the Labour Party, for the defeat of the Right Wing, as the key to enabling the working class to realise its own potential strength. We know that the Communist Party, the only organised Marxist political party in Britain, has a vital leading role to play. Without the Communist Party and the *Morning Star*, the growth and victory of the Left movement as a whole, the defeat of the right wing in the Labour Party would not be possible. Anyone studying the actual course of the present industrial and political movements will be aware of it, without Lord Robens and the press commentators to exaggerate the point.

The growth in numbers and influence of the Communist Party is the one essential condition for social advance. Our growing unity in action and understanding with all other left forces, is the other. Such unity is open and honest, and is based upon our both making and receiving criticism. We do not hide our criticism of the Right Wing theories and policies. These are the source of disunity and defeat. Neither will we fail to criticise what we disagree with in the arguments of our left allies. But we do so constructively, and with due modesty, seeking to strengthen our alliance, and not to destroy it.

To draw the widest sections of people into struggle is the essential beginning of political progress. But struggle alone can go round in circles, unless there is a realisable programme leading towards socialist change.

This is what the *British Road to Socialism* provides. There are no other revolutionary "short cuts". That it will be improved and developed further is probable, and this discussion in *Marxism Today* can help the process. But that it is needed now, amongst all those coming into political life and industrial action, is certain. It is to be hoped that our discussion will be carried far beyond the present readers of *Marxism Today*, and will finally reflect a very wide debate on our ideas in many sections of the mass movement.

(Contributions of up to 2,000 words on this article are invited).

(continued from page 32)

not ruled out absolutely. But they are ruled out relatively since in a revolutionary transition, the government needs to be the instrument of the dictatorship of the revolutionary class—that government to be representative of the revolutionary will of the revolutionary class and led by the revolutionary Party of the proletariat—until such time as the need for parties as such withers away.

Indeed, to one who has spent far too much time during his life being involved in "Party" politics, meetings etc., one of the chief attractions of Communism is that, eventually, it does away with the need for parties, as such—realising that they are means to an end, not an end in themselves. I often ask my Social Democratic friends in the Labour Party who somehow confuse the existence of parties as being necessary for democracy, what they would do if the Labour Party won all the 630 seats it contested (which is presumably the logic behind standing)—would they give the Tories a few seats "to make it democratic"?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trends in British Psychiatry

Bruce Burns

The author is a consultant psychiatrist in Birmingham and a Clinical Tutor, Birmingham University. Lately University Department of Psychiatry, Manchester.

Historical Perspective

Despite a continuing polemic as to the cause of mental illness, since the last century there has been a great advance in the care and treatment of patients with psychiatric disorders in Britain. This advance was initially made possible by legislation. Legislation was essential because of the following factors: The mentally ill were liable to harm themselves and others; they were often unable to look after themselves and their belongings; and further in order to stop people being detained in institutions unjustly. Through the Lunatics Act of 1845, the Lunacy Act of 1890, the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, the Mental Treatment Act of 1930 and finally the Mental Health Act of 1959, progress in the care of the subnormal and mentally ill was initiated. County asylums were established and the care of the mentally ill and subnormal came under single authorities, to the slow but increasing advantage of the patient.

Despite individual pioneers like Phillipe Pinel at the end of the 18th century in France and John Conolly 50 years later in England, who literally released patients from their chains, it is only since the 1930's that a more general era of enlightenment towards patients in asylums has come about. Up to then the demoniacal theories of disease, part of the early Christian Faith, held sway: mental illness was due to possession by evil spirits. Appalling cruelty was justified by such theories, aided by a deep rooted fear and horror of psychotic behaviour. In order to drive the evil spirits out of the body patients, or the current more derogatory term lunatics, were flogged, repeatedly immersed in ice cold water and placed in leg locks, straight-jackets and solitary confinement for days. Purging and blood letting were frequently practised.

Prior to the Mental Treatment Act of 1930 the mentally ill could only be admitted to asylums if they had been certified and by so doing deprived of all civil rights. Asylums became the places of last resort. Apart from the Maudsley Hospital opened in 1915 by the LCC at the instigation of Dr. Henry Maudsley there were virtually no provisions in Great Britain for diagnosis and treatment in the early stages of mental illness; neither were there facilities for the teaching of psychiatry. The asylums were pervaded by a stifling Victorian authoritarianism. There were no discharges amongst the thousands of patients. It was convenient to leave the many patients who had made spontaneous recoveries undisturbed to work in these custodial institutions divorced from progress in the understanding of mental illness.

From the 1930's, when asylums became open to voluntary patients, a slow, but eventually massive discharge in numbers of patients has occurred. This process is continuing to this day. Patients who have been in hospital for over 30 years are being belatedly rehabilitated. This delay has been due to a large part to the parsimony of successive governments and local authorities in providing real community services. Facilities for a true continuity of care are needed as are hostels, varied rehabilitation units, sheltered workshops, old peoples homes and so on.

New Treatment Techniques

The average stay in hospital for new admissions has over successive years dwindled from 8 to 6 to under 4 weeks. Only approximately 4 per cent of patients are now admitted on a compulsory treatment order and these invariably expire after 28 days. With the increase in expenditure on medical care for psychiatric disorders went a reduction in the social cost of incapacity, including an earlier return to work. A recent comparison of three psychiatric hospitals showed that the one which spent most on medical care was able to discharge its patients most quickly and had the lowest cost per patient-illness for admissions.

From the '30's new treatment techniques were introduced. Patients began to be treated without the loss of human dignity that went with physical restraint. Insulin coma treatment, chemically induced convulsive therapy and later electroconvulsive therapy and the leucotomy operation were introduced from Hungary, Austria, Italy and Portugal respectively. Electroconvulsive therapy has transformed psychiatric institutions and turned into a reality the motif that the illness of psychotic patients is reversible and that patients can return home to enjoy a reasonable life.

Following the 1950's there has been a drugs explosion. Again treatments have arisen almost entirely on an empirical basis. Research into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-histamines necessary for the treatment of war wounds led to the arrival of the tranquillisers, drugs that calmed disturbed patients at a dosage that did not have an hypnotic effect and by which, for example, the psychotic process in schizophrenia can be suppressed. Unlike existing sedatives, as the dosage was raised sleep was not immediately induced. Anti-depressant drugs were developed by accident from drugs used in the treatment of tuberculosis. Patients with a depressive illness could be treated as out patients and tranquillisers allowed for the resocialisation of schizophrenic patients.

National Health Service

The present day advances in treatment practice in psychiatry could never have been realised without the introduction of the National Health Service in 1948.

Born at the time of the upsurge of socialist thinking and voting, following the second world war. The transition of asylums to hospitals came about because of their transfusion with many more professional personnel and the money to start to carry out humane care and the new treatment techniques. Out-patient clinics and in-patient units in general hospitals, psychiatric hostels and rehabilitation units have gradually extended the delivery of the service. Their distribution is absurdly inadequate to provide a comprehensive continuous community care system.

In some patients where there are rapidly recurring psychotic attacks or where the initial illness was untreated modern treatments are less effective. However, traditional idleness and apathy are being replaced by planned programmes of occupational therapy and industrial therapy. Industrial rehabilitation facilities including graded workshops are very poor in this country compared for example with those in the Soviet Union.[1] Patients are humiliated with a week's wage in shillings. Facilities for planned retraining are scanty. Many thousands of patients give up and remain idle at home where the cost to the country must be immense. Again advances in diagnosis, treatment and retraining techniques in subnormality cannot be fully realised for want of a massive financial transfusion.

Over the past 5 years the development of the NHS has almost ground to a halt. The past right wing labour government has a responsibility for this state of affairs as they have for the stagnation of other social services. The maintenance cost of the NHS has run at 4.5 per cent of the national income compared with 6 per cent in most West European countries and 8 per cent in the USA. Further, capital expenditure in the UK has been th per cent compared with 1 per cent in West Europe and 2 per cent in the USA. An ever increasing number of capital schemes in NHS Hospitals have been funded from maintenance money with the consequent visible delapidation of existing buildings.

Psychiatric disorders in general are common throughout the world. In Britain it has been estimated that 10 per cent of adults on GPs' lists will each year seek treatment for an unequivocal psychiatric disorder and this figure will rise to over 50 per cent if you include all those patients in whom symptoms arise as stress disorders. Approximately 45 per cent of all hospital beds provided by the NHS are for the care of the mentally ill and subnormal. Today's child has a 1 in 9 chance if a girl and 1 in 14 chance if a boy of being admitted to a psychiatric hospital during her or his lifetime. Seventeen million working days were lost in 1967 from disorders that were primarily of a mental nature—the leading single cause of work loss and over 10 times more than those days lost by strikes.

Morbidity from Psychiatric Disorders

It is necessary not to automatically equate emotional suffering and misery with mental illness (The concept of mental illness will be discussed later). Misery from social distress particularly affects the deprived sections of the community. In contrast there is evidence that the wealthier are taking greater advantage of the psychiatric services of the NHS, as they are with all the other divisions of the NHS.

The prevalence rates of the common mental illnesses are difficult to obtain, however some idea of their high frequency is obtained from the following figures. Patients with a schizophrenic illness occupy more hospital beds than any other illness in the world. The prevalence figure is approximately 0.8—1 per cent of the total population, with little alteration in all those countries, regardless of the social order, in which estimates have been attempted. It is an illness that particularly affects those between 15 and 40 years of age. For affective illnesses (those illnesses where a change of mood, depression or elation, usually dominates the picture) a figure of 3 per cent is the mean of several studies in the UK and Scandinavia of the chance of developing such an illness in a person who lives a full 74 years, (approximate mean expectation of life for these countries). There are 300,000 epileptics in England and Wales, one third are under 16, 50 per cent are controlled by drugs and only 40 per cent have more than 1 fit per annum.

There are estimated to be over 300,000 alcoholic addicts in the United Kingdom, this figure excludes

[1] *Soviet Psychiatry and the Russian Citizen*, Mike Gorman, International Journal of Psychiatry, November, 1969.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problem drinkers and heavy drinkers. Further that the cost to the country is in the region of 250 million pounds per annum. Addiction to cigarette smoking according to the chief Ministry of Health medical officer causes 150,000 deaths per annum (lung cancer, other lung diseases and coronary thrombosis) in the UK. One fifth of all absences from work for illness can be connected in some way with cigarette smoking. He states that the greatest single public health measure would be for the nation to stop smoking. Hard drug addiction is a much smaller problem approximately 2,000 in the UK, however the mortality rate here is 10-20 per cent, per annum. It is the largest single cause of death for adolescents in New York City. Drug dependency (e.g. night sedation over years) is a very much larger problem, yet still not approaching the problem of cigarette smoking in terms of morbidity and mortality.

Use of Drugs

There is little doubt that there is over prescribing and undisciplined prescribing by the medical profession, who in turn are pressurised by the drug firms to do just this. To British Psychiatry must go most of the credit for the introduction into medicine generally of the controlled therapeutic trial, the only means by which new treatment procedures can be scientifically evaluated. Such knowledge should be disseminated throughout the medical profession to curtail overprescribing together with the fact that no new drug will act as a panacea for the distress of men, women and children caught in the direct and indirect backwash of the inhumanity of capitalism.

Major tranquillisers and tricyclic anti-depressant drugs (which are not stimulants) have a specific use practically confined to mental illness. That they should be used in a slipshod method is a possibility of which doctors and public must be made aware. Many patients would say they benefited from their use when involved in some of the stresses of modern life. Doctors should again be made more aware of their misuse and dangers including getting into the habit of regularly prescribing day or night sedation. There is no place for hypocrisy in drug taking in turning one's wrath on the long haired youth. The problem is global, especially when one considers the misuse of alcohol, sleeping tablets and nicotine. The real answer here is to change the unsatisfactory, inhuman conditions under which many people work and live, combined with public education and the provision of facilities for the practice of techniques of breaking such habits.

A Rebuttal of Psychogenic Determinism

How have the new treatments arrived? Mainly on an empirical basis. Up to date there has been a startling failure of devising remedies from theory and assuming they must be effective. Psychiatry has had more than its share of facile aetiological theories.

There has been a failure to look at the patient as a whole together with an all to frequent reluctance to extract the full details from the patient of his actual complaints. There is no alternative to taking from the patient detailed information on why he seeks medical help, what he finds unpleasant and as complete a description as possible of any abnormal experiences he may have had. Information on the change in his mental life should then be linked with any observed behavioural change. The speculators are frequently amongst those who avoid the hard work of obtaining this information in full. Similarly they avoid or fail to understand the difference between meaningful and causal connections.

Meaningful connections are those factors that appear to link cause and effect in the light of the patients' culture or in the light of the interpreters' or doctors' culture. Causal connections are scientific connections, where *b* invariably follow *a* on the basis of validation by the usual tenets of the scientific method.

Despite an ever increasing body of knowledge, the exact cause of the major psychoses, including idiopathic epilepsy, is not known. The situation is not dissimilar to the major medical illnesses despite, as in psychiatry, massive advances in treatment. Psychological stress factors can frequently be found to precede illness, however, psychological stress is a fact of life, especially in capitalist society, where the contradictions of social living are all pervasive. Some of the supposed psychological causes of illness can frequently be found to post-date the onset of such illnesses (e.g. the psychological disturbance in parents consequent on having an autistic or schizophrenic child). Those who say that there are invariably psychological factors, showing a direct causal connection with the psychosis, are not only playing to the gallery, but also doing a gross injustice to the dignity of patients with the illness and to their relatives.

Factors and Causes

The above said, one must further distinguish between precipitating factors and true causes. There is ample evidence to show that certain endocrine diseases, like thyrotoxicosis, allergic diseases like asthma, duodenal ulcers, depressive illness and epilepsy can be triggered off by gross psychological stress. This, however, does not mean that psychological stress is the true cause of these illnesses. They can all develop spontaneously and remit spontaneously, as can schizophrenia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is very little convincing evidence to show that treatment solely by discourse (psychotherapy) in the affective psychosis (both depression and mania) has any influence on promoting a remission of this disease, in contrast to modern physical methods of treatment. The significance of psychological stress in the psychoses has to be viewed with caution. The occurrence of severe stress in childhood as a promotor of a psychosis occurring 30 years later in adulthood is not born out by any clear evidence. To be credible psychological stress must immediately precede the development of mental symptoms.

The Concept of Illness

The concept of illness requires careful thought. Semantic confusion has particularly befogged progress in developing psychiatric knowledge. Illnesses are disorders which arise as a result of pathological processes in which there is a detectable abnormality of the body fluids or structure. The discovery of pathological changes, many of which are secondary gives you clues, but not necessarily the answer to the exact causation of the illness. Mental illness means illness with mental symptoms, illness that presents itself as a psychological disturbance. The predominant psychiatric thought in Britain, the Continent and in the USSR is that the psychoses are illnesses, that is they have a physical basis.

Such an opinion is based on the following facts and qualitative changes:

1. their spontaneous relapses and remissions;
2. the abnormal mental symptoms that occur in the active phases, that never occur in the normal range of human experience;
3. the consistent biological symptoms such as massive weight loss, anergia, altered sleep rhythm and other diurnal (24 hour) changes;
4. in some cases the genetic predisposition;
5. the rapid response to certain forms of physical treatment; and
6. the electro-encephalographic and biochemical changes that are now being consistently demonstrated.

The argument that exact causation must precede a satisfactory classification of mental illness is considered not to be necessary and is certainly not a tradition of the empirical advances in British medicine. It is argued here in reverse that, before investigations can even begin, a disorder must be isolated albeit in some cases on purely an elaborate descriptive basis and differentiated from other syndromes. A descriptive classification must precede a truely scientific aetiological classification. A classification system is essential in any scientific

ORDER NOW
from
CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

THE PARIS COMMUNE

SPECIAL ILLUSTRATED ISSUE OF "MARXISM TODAY"
MARCH 1971

FRANÇOIS HINCKER	*The Commune: a Brief Chronology*
MAURICE MOISSONIER	*The Experience of the Commune: Marxism and the Problem of the State.*
JEAN BRUHAT	*The Political Trends within the Commune*
JACQUES GIRAULT	*Students in the Commune*
A. L. MORTON	*The Paris Commune and its Effect in Britain*
STANLEY HUTCHINS	*The Communard Exiles in Britain*

Articles that cannot, for reasons of space, be included in the March issue, will be printed in the April and May issues.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discipline, primarily as a means of communication, without it there would be chaos. Avoiding classification and namely diagnosis in the psychoses amounts to lazy thinking and not infrequently to criminal negligence in so far as the witholding of treatment of the sick patient is concerned. Similar reprehensible behaviour occurs where patients themselves or their relatives are blamed sometimes by veiled inference for the occurrence of e.g. an autistic child or a psychotic illness. Disciplines where there are areas of fact and areas of ignorance form the happy hunting ground of speculators who with their loose thinking try to fit everything into their own school of philosophy, morality or faith (religious or political). Unfortunately the presence or absence of a particular faith does not either prevent or produce a psychotic illness.

Content and Form of Thought Processes

There remains a persistent error in this field especially in the psychoses (illnesses), of failing to distinguish between the content of the thought processes and their form. It is the latter which is the most important. The thought content in a depressive illness has an all pervasive depressive form. Themes of erring in life's task and that an end of it would be welcomed are varied a thousand and one times. That a patient experiences thoughts being put in or taken out of his head by means of God or an X-ray machine, does not mean that God or X-ray machines are the cause of his mental illness. Rather that he is simply experiencing a phenomenon, technically described as thought intrusion, or thought withdrawal characteristic of a disorder agreed on following many years of careful description to be called schizophrenia.

Man's rationality allows him to postulate the means by which unique qualitatively different thought processes (such as the above) are mediated. The fact is we do not know exactly how these pathological mental processes are mediated. That such a patient could be told to pull himself together is analogous to telling a man with advanced cancer that he should recover by the use of his will power alone. In the absence of a philosophical basis to British psychiatry many confusing theories abound. The false dichotomy of mind and body still remains in medicine generally. Fashions come and go.

A recent but declining vogue is that of psychosomatic disease. It is a concept which defies definition, but implies a psychological aetiology. This group of diseases is said to include asthma, peptic ulcer, ulcerative colitis, rheumatoid arthritis, eczema, migraine, high blood pressure, etc. It is only because these diseases have an unknown exact aetiology that speculative psychological theories have gained favour in some quarters. One does not doubt the psychological component of the above diseases, which in fact is an important component of all disease, especially those of a recurring nature. What is suggested is that for the most part the psychological disturbance is a consequence of adjustment to the physical disease and not vice versa. This does not contradict the view that psychological stress can for instance precipitate an attack of asthma, or exacerbate an attack. Scientific evidence that psychological stress causes asthma is lacking, in contrast to the evidence of an allergic process. In all disease there is a continuous interaction between mind and body, in fact they function as a whole. Symptoms of a disease have a consistent form, but may be coloured by the culture and the personality of the patient.

The history of medicine including psychiatry provides a catalogue of attempts to find single simple explanations for a whole range of maladies, the psychosomatic theory has been one of these. Others have included, "unnatural living", various kinds of "strain", constipation, masturbation, focal sepsis and more recently autoimmunity.

Need for a Global Approach

In finding the psychosomatic disease concept wanting it is important to realise that very varied bodily symptoms, including tension headaches, palpitations and diarrhoea can arise from emotional states occurring as a result of psychological stress in everyday life. These stress disorders in themselves do not fall into the definition of illness or disease outlined earlier. No organic lesion is present or postulated. However, patients with such symptoms are very common today and frequently fail to receive the sympathy, explanation and treatment they deserve. Similarly such stress symptoms can complicate any known disease. A global approach is necessary, including information on work and domestic pressures and on the personality of the patient, before a useful understanding can be made. Some specialists appear to wear blinkers by choice, their sole business they imply is to know most about so and so, but to know nothing about their patients.

With the rekindling of dynamic psychiatry under the fans of the mirage makers of present day capitalist society, explanations of man's social predicament are constantly forthcoming. Professor Henry Miller writes

> "Since the flight into so-called dynamic psychiatry with its speculative and entirely affirmative basis in psychological determinism, psychiatry has suffered from a surfeit of complicated and improbable theory and a dearth of simple testable hypotheses. Not unnaturally the psychiatrist who believes that the phenomena of mental illness can be explained on the basis of a universal theory, and not by verifying fragmentary pieces of hard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> information one by one to build a growing structure of certain knowledge, finds little difficulty in inflating his theory to explain not only mental disease but also normal human behaviour, interpersonal relations, and ultimately world affairs".

He goes on to question how far the psychiatrist should permit his subject to be used loosely and sometimes cynically to ensure the smooth working of society. Narrow schools of thought which "understand" all on the basis of psychological determinism and amongst other things conveniently ignore political and economic factors, simply amount to mysticism. They lead to a cynical and patronising attitude to those afflicted with psychiatric disorders and further foster the dangerous view that patients with mental illness can be "talked out" of their illness. There is a vested interest in retaining these speculative schools of psychological determinism, usually with an associated refusal to argue outside their own semantic jargon. This is not only to provide a smoke screen for the socio-economic crisis of capitalism, but also to provide an inferior psychological service within the NHS, free from medical and outside criticism.

Dynamic interelations are relevant to man's immediate social, intellectual and spiritual life. They do not however, in themselves provide a unifying theoretical substructure to account for all human actions, excluding as they usually do the socio-economic factor and the factors of biological and physical disease processes.

Recent Advances and the Problem of Rehabilitation

Preconceived systems of ideas are common in this field, especially in those people with little aquaintance of mental illness and also amongst those in psychiatry who avoid the most seriously ill. "I don't believe anyone is mad or mentally ill, but a lot of people have problems in living". Szasz (USA) Behaviour that is labelled schizophrenic, "is a special strategy that a person invents in order to live in an unliveable situation". Laing (England). These word-mongers who appeal to the gallery with their sentimental loose thinking are dangerous. Patients and their families are humiliated in the name of seeking out the "truth", the "only" treatment for such an illness. The idea that you can "talk out" a patients system of delusions amounts to chicanery. Spontaneous remissions occur in nearly all forms of mental illness, so that these limelighters will always be able to claim individual "successes" for their treatments.

Descriptive (phenomenological) psychiatry has contributed increasing precision to diagnosis and classification of psychiatric disorders. The above painstaking exercise has permitted ever-increasing objectivity to the scientific evaluation of new treatment methods. First rank (primary) symptoms of schizophrenia, whose content varies but form remains the same, are being taught to doctors in training, as are the biological symptoms and more objective mental symptoms (psychopathology) of affective illnesses, both depression and mania. The distinction between form and content of mental symptoms, with an emphasis on the former is beginning to be realised in British psychiatry; as is the intrinsic quality of some of the major psychoses to undergo spontaneous remissions and relapses.

Physical methods of treatment (including drugs) have shown remarkable efficacy in promoting remissions from attacks of specific mental illnesses. A process of resocialisation and rehabilitation is still possible in those cases where only a partial remission is achieved. Patients can be restored to full health or at least to a dignified existence. Only a shocking lack of workshops of all kinds, rehabilitation units, hostels, old peoples homes etc. fail to allow for the maximum return to normal living. The extension of community services are held up by parsimonious governments and local authorities. Where such facilities have begun to exist treatment and continuous aftercare where necessary can be practised. Lack of effective rehabilitation is condemning many psychiatric patients to long-stay wards where there is no real need for them to be.

Research

A pitifully small amount of money is spent on psychiatric research, for example only 8 per cent of the Medical Research Council's 1965 budget. A multi-disciplinary approach in research and treatment practices is and will continue to lead to increasing understanding. Epidemiology, genetics, biochemistry pharmacology and behaviour therapy are changing and invigorating the subject. Fear of a materialistic basis for the major illnesses amongst the speculators is now becoming apparent.

Consistent gross alterations of electrolytes (salts in the body fluids), steroid and amine metabolism have been found in affective illnesses. By replacing the sodium ion in the intracellular fluid by lithium (the next element in the periodic table) evidence suggests that the tendency to recur of these illnesses can be prevented. In affective illnesses the very good response to treatment of an individual attack that is now possible, together with the potential of a true prophylactic treatment could represent a major public health breakthrough.

Again in schizophrenia there has been a recent important advance in the shape of long acting intra-muscular phenothiazine preparations. It has been estimated that 50 per cent of the relapses of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this illness follow patients stopping taking tablets. Monthly injections for those in whom the activity of the disease is long lasting, is making a real difference to their lives, including allowing them to get back to work.

Despite earlier writers' reports schizophrenia is not a product of poverty. The incidence of first attacks is evenly distributed throughout the social classes. Evidence exists that, subsequent to the onset of the illness, the third that make only a poor response to treatment slide down the social scale, in part because of inadequate rehabilitation facilities. Further evidence exists to show that the discharge rate of schizophrenics with severe residual damage is higher in the most deprived boroughs of cities, thus adding to the problem of the "twilight areas", where the necessary community facilities are negligeable. Those who do get work in open industry are amongst the first to be out of work following, "programmes of redeployment", more commonly known as the sack. There should be a law to enforce employers to take back employees who have recovered from a mental illness and who are deemed fit to work by their medical advisers. The trade union movement could profitably (in terms of human lives) work for the introduction of remedial departments in large factories.

Personality Development

From the foregoing it can be seen that a physical basis is postulated for the psychoses, or the mental illnesses. Such an hypothesis is not postulated for the bulk of the neuroses (a term which defies precise definition). Here, although some physical changes take place (as with the outpouring of adrenalin in flight and even a recurrent response of this type that may occur; in the process of conditioning to specific, sometimes apparently trivial, circumstances), no such qualitative physical change is postulated as with the psychoses.

Man's personality is plastic and in every man it arises as a result of a continuous interaction between biological and environmental factors. Patterns of behaviour become more set with time, but they remain modifiable. There are however many who see large numbers of people as immutably inadequate; this of course in terms of the social mores of our present capitalist society. In contrast there are others, including Marxists, who see man with limitless potential, where an ultimate profound satisfaction from work and leisure can be the lot of all. Too many psychological and psychodynamic theories have ignored the laws of society, where economic factors basically predetermine relationships between men and predetermine family life and the development of each child. Even the purveyors of "mental health" forsake socio-economic pressures for narrower more exciting fields of interpersonal relationships in isolation, or sexual adjustment, which they fail to see as only secondary to the former. They are somehow blind to the gross social restrictions in early life which go to render some men more vulnerable than others to stresses like redundancy, chronic physical illness, unsatisfactory working conditions and other situations where a massive emotional readjustment is required.

The anti-human quality of competitive capitalism, with its built-in work and housing insecurity, lack of participation in matters that affect working or family lives and little real social mixing for large sections of the community, appears not only to restrict personality development but also to highlight personality frailties. These frailties are then in turn used as the explanation of why social life itself is so disturbed. Varied and complex inward-looking speculative theories are forever forthcoming to maintain the smoke screen. Anything is appropriate matter to distract attention from the basic shortcoming of capitalist society, based on the economic exploitation of man by man.

Psychiatry and Social Distress

The emphasis in this article has been to isolate mental illness, in which there appears a qualitative change, a break in the life pattern, and for which a physical basis however subtle is postulated. In contrast in the area of personality development psychiatry has had less to offer. Loneliness is for example reported to be one of the main reasons for consulting a psychiatrist in big cities in the USA. Misery can arise from both mental illness and social distress. Psychiatry can obviously only palliate problems arising from social distress. It can no more answer them than witchcraft. Here lies the biggest abuse of psychiatry taking place today.

It is misused to provide a scapegoat and an explanation for the socio-economic crisis of capitalism. An internal weakness of man amounting to "inadequacy" or an "illness" becomes the alternative to highlighting the demand for a better level of social existence. No medical diagnosis or drug will solve this problem. Anger at man's inhumanity to man in the shape of child poverty, a drastically too low basic wage, inadequate education and an alienated working and social life should be correctly placed—at the doorstep of capitalism. This situation should be changed.

Most Marxists would see personality as pliable and as a product of society. A society develops the restricted or other type of person as its structure permits. Restricted people incompletely educated and thwarted at work will become discontented. Capitalism with its narrow education and rigid social roles involving very limited self expression or participation has a lot to answer for restricting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human personality development over generations.

As a first step comprehensive education with a vast broadening of the meaning of education and expansion of facilities for youth could help redress the balance. Emotional development in childhood with instruction and participation in the real moral and social issues facing the world has been ignored or treated superficially in our schools. Eradication of the 11-plus selection system would be a positive way of helping to replace apathy, or arrogance and rabid competitiveness, by understanding, comradeship and a sense of purpose involving all men. Child psychological services should be broadened and expanded to deal with all children with specific learning difficulties and emotional problems. Too many children are "written off" with handicaps, that given facilities, professional personnel and close links with the family and the school, could be surmounted.

The turmoil of adolescence would be calmer if every child's needs were really catered for. They could learn to participate in the life that was going on around them. Interestingly, in negro areas in the USA where there has been the biggest growth of the Black Power movement, there has been a marked fall in drug taking in the young.

Boarding schools in the shape of the present public schools could be used to better advantage by the large sections of grossly deprived children that exist. Parents whose lives have been thwarted by previous eras of capitalism and current threats to their basic needs find little opportunity to help and enjoy their children. That these basic deprivations lead to undeveloped personalities, discontent and the neuroses in general is undoubted. That they are directly related to mental illness in the context used earlier in this article is unproven and unlikely.

The Future Perspective

Future understanding of mental illness requires more humility and a greater respect for the body of knowledge that already exists. The teaching of the subject to medical students, psychologists, social workers, nurses and others coming into the field needs to be more objective and more detailed. More of these future professional workers should come from the working class in order that they can begin to understand the every day problems of the majority of their patients. In identifying the major illnesses culture may determine the content, but not the form of the illness. It is necessary for professional workers to know that culture to identify the qualitative change in form that heralds the onset of mental illness. It is at this early stage of illness that one can expect the maximum benefit from treatment, by professional and not amateur workers.

On the subject of preventive medicine some comments have already been made. Each year 7,000 people commit suicide in the UK and this is probably an underestimate. Suicide is in the top ten causes of death for adult men in the UK. Suicide, which has distinct differences from suicidal gestures, is a pattern of behaviour not amounting in itself to a disease. However in the majority of cases in this country evidence suggests that a biological qualitative change, with a consistent form, has occurred. Such a change is called a depressive illness and is not the same as a normal mood change of depression. You can in fact have a depressive illness without an obvious affective (mood) change of depression. In a recent retrospective survey of suicide 80 per cent were found to have consulted their doctor in the preceding 2 weeks with symptoms of a depressive illness. In this instance to advise a patient to pull himself together, buy a poodle, or withhold physical treatment, is tantamount to negligence.

Workers in the field of psychiatric disorders and those concerned in different organisations should work together for a break in the policy of the last Labour Government, where almost their whole effort was directed at encouraging the private sector of industry at the expense, in particular, of the community services. Half of the population of Britain's psychiatric hospitals could be discharged overnight with the development of adequate community facilities. The same holds for subnormality hospitals. CARE an organisation set up to train and care for the mentally subnormal estimate that 36,000 people are unnecessarily present in Britains overcrowded mental subnormality hospitals, including more than 7,000 children.

In conclusion the crisis facing British medicine stems from the absence of an underlying philosophy. It fails to be concerned with man as a whole. Overspecialisation and "curative medicine" have pushed preventive methods into the shadows and this is especially so in psychiatry. Knowledge exists to redress this imbalance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Draft of a Communist Credo

F. Engels

This was prepared as a draft for a programme of the Communist League, formed at its first Congress in London in June 1847. Engels played a big part in its elaboration but it was worked out in its final form at the Congress itself and adopted on June 9, 1847. Engels finally wrote it out and it was sent to all organisations of the League as an official Congress document under the signatures of the President, Karl Schapper and of the Secretary, Wilhelm Wolff, for discussion, criticism and amendment.

As can be seen from some of the answers, Engels did not have it all his own way and the draft contains a number of formulations which differ in many important respects from those of Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto *and of Engels in his* Principles of Communism *(which preceded the Manifesto).* Jack Cohen

Question 1. Are you a Communist?

Answer. Yes.

Question 2. What are the aims of the Communists?

Answer. To organise society in such a way that every one of its members can develop and use all his powers and capacities in complete freedom, without thereby violating the basic foundations of society.

Question 3. How do you propose to achieve these aims?

Answer. By the elimination of private property and its replacement by common ownership.

Question 4. On what basis do you justify your common ownership?

Answer. Firstly, on the mass of productive forces and means of life resulting from the development of industry, agriculture, trade and colonisation, and on the possibilities inherent in machinery, chemical and other resources for their infinite extension. Secondly, on the fact that there exists in the consciousness and sentiments of every individual certain principles which are regarded as irrevocable and fundamental, principles which, resulting from the whole of historical development, require no proof.

Question 5. What are such principles?

Answer. For example, every individual strives to be happy. The happiness of the individual is inseparable from the happiness of all, etc.

Question 6. How do you propose to prepare the way for your common ownership?

Answer. By enlightening and uniting the proletariat.

Question 7. What is the proletariat?

Answer. The proletariat is that class in society which lives exclusively by its labour and not on the profit of any kind of capital; that class whose well-being and whose distress, whose life and death, therefore, depends on the succession of good and bad times in business; in a word, on the ups and downs of competition.

Question 8. Have there not always been proletarians, then?

Answer. No. There have always been *poor* and *labouring* classes; and those who laboured were almost always the poor. But there have not always been proletarians, just as competition has not always been free.

Question 9. How did the proletariat arise?

Answer. The proletariat came into being as a result of the introduction of machines, which began to be invented in the middle of the last century and the most important of which are: the steam engine, the spinning machine and the mechanical loom. These machines, which were very dear and were, therefore, only able to be acquired by those with plenty of money, drove the artisans of the time out of business, since by the use of machinery it was possible to produce goods more quickly and cheaply than the artisans, with their undeveloped spinning wheels and looms, were able to do. In this way, machinery was responsible for transferring industry entirely into the hands of the big capitalists and made the small amount of property owned by the artisans, mainly tools, looms, etc., quite worthless, so that the capitalist was left with everything, the artisan with nothing. And so the factory system was introduced. Once the capitalists saw how advantageous this system was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for them, they sought to extend it to more and more branches of industry. They divided work up between the workers more and more so that workers who previously had produced the whole of a piece of work now only produced a part of it. Labour simplified in this way produced goods more quickly and therefore more cheaply and thenceforward, it was found that machinery could be used in almost every branch of industry. Thus as soon as any branch of industry went over to factory production it ended up in the hands of the big capitalists—especially in spinning and weaving—and the artisans were deprived of the last relics of their independence.

We have gradually arrived at the position where almost *all* branches of industry are run on a factory basis. This has brought about the ruin of the previously existing middle class more and more, especially of the small master craftsmen, completely transformed the previous position of the worker and now two new classes which have gradually swallowed up all the remaining ones, have been created, namely:

(1) the class of big capitalists who are in almost exclusive possession of the means of life in advanced capitalist countries and of the means (machines, factories, workshops, etc.) whereby these means of life are produced. This is the class of *bourgeois, or the bourgeoisie.*

(2) the class of those who are completely propertyless, who are therefore compelled to sell their labour[1] to the first class, the bourgeois, simply in order to obtain their means of life from them in return. Since the parties to this trade in labour are not *equal,* but the bourgeois have the advantage, the propertyless must agree to the onerous conditions laid down by the bourgeois. This class, dependent on the bourgeois, is called the class of *proletarians* or the *proletariat.*

Question 10. How is the proletarian different from the slave?

Answer. The slave is sold *once* and for all, the proletarian has to sell himself daily and by the hour. The slave is the property of *one single* master and his existence, miserable though it may be, is therefore assured. The proletarian is, so to speak, the slave of the entire bourgeois *class,* not of one single master, and does not therefore have an assured existence, since no-one will buy his labour if he does not need it. The slave is regarded as a *thing* and not as a member of civil society. The proletarian is recognised as a *person,* as a member of civil society. The slave *may,* therefore, have a better existence than the proletarian but the latter lives in a higher stage of development. The slave liberates himself by *becoming a proletarian,* eliminating *only* the relationship of *slavery* from the totality of property relations. The proletarian can only free himself by *abolishing property altogether.*

Question 11. How is the proletarian different from the serf?

Answer. The serf has the use of a piece of land, that is, of a means, an instrument, of production in return for handing over a greater or lesser portion of the produce. The proletarian works with means and instruments of production which belong to someone else who, in return for his labour, advances him a portion, determined by competition, of the products. The share of the serf is determined by his own labour, that is, by himself. In the case of the proletarian it is determined by competition, that is, by the bourgeois first of all. The serf has an assured existence, the proletarian has not. The serf liberates himself by driving out his feudal lord and becoming a property owner himself, by joining in competition and becoming a member of the owning, of the privileged class. The proletarian liberates himself by doing away with property, competition, and all class differences.

Question 12. How is the proletarian different from the artisan?

Answer. As opposed to the proletarian, the so-called artisan, who still existed nearly everywhere during the last century and still exists here and there, is at best, a *temporary* proletarian. His aim is to acquire capital in order to exploit other workers. He can often achieve this aim where the craft guilds still exist or where freedom to follow a trade has not yet led to the elimination of the artisan by factory production, or to intense competition. As soon as factory conditions are introduced into handwork and competition reigns, this prospect is eliminated and the artisan becomes a proletarian more and more. The artisan therefore liberates himself *either* by becoming a bourgeois or in general passing over into the ranks of the middle class *or,* by being transformed into a proletarian as a result of competition (as now happens to most) and takes part in the movement of the proletariat—i.e. the more or less conscious communist movement.

[1] Marx and Engels later made this formulation much more precise. They emphasised that the worker does not sell his "labour", but his "labour-*power*". See Engels' Introduction to "Wage, Labour and Capital" Marx. (Tr.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Question 13. Do you not believe that the common ownership of goods would have been possible at any time?

Answer. No—Communism has only arisen since machinery and other inventions made it possible to hold out the prospect of an all-sided education, a happy existence, for all members of society. Communism is the theory of a liberation which was not possible for the slave, the serf, or the artisan, but only for the proletariat and hence it belongs of necessity to the 19th century and was not conceivable in any earlier period.

Question 14. Reverting to the sixth question, are you not rejecting the revolution when you wish to prepare for common ownership simply by enlightening and uniting the proletariat?

Answer. We are convinced not only of the uselessness but of the harmfulness of all conspiracies. We are also aware that revolutions are not made deliberately and arbitrarily but that everywhere and at all times they are the necessary consequence of circumstances which are not, in any way whatsoever, dependent either on the will or on the leadership of individual parties or of whole classes. But we also see that the development of the proletariat is forcibly repressed by the possessing classes in nearly every country in the world and that, in this way, a revolution is being forcibly engendered by the opponents of Communism. If, in the end, the oppressed proletariat is pushed into a revolution in this way, then we will defend the cause of the proletariat by our deeds just as well as we are now doing this by our words.

Question 15. Do you intend to replace the existing social order by common ownership at one blow?

Answer. This is not our view. The development of the masses cannot be ordered by decrees. It will be determined by the conditions in which the masses live and will, therefore, proceed slowly.

Question 16. How do you think the transition from the present situation to common ownership will be effected?

Answer. The first, fundamental condition for the introduction of common ownership is the political liberation of the proletariat, by the establishment of a democratic constitution.

Question 17. What will be your first measure once you have established democracy?

Answer. Assuring the existence of the proletariat.

Question 18. How will you do this?

Answer.

(1) By the limitation of private property in such a way that it gradually prepares the way for its own transformation into social property, e.g., by progressive taxation, limitation of the right of inheritance in favour of the State, etc., etc.

(2) By employing workers in national workshops and factories as well as on land belonging to the nation.

(3) By the education of all children at the expense of the State.

Question 19. How will you arrange this kind of education during the period of transition?

Answer. All children will be educated *in* state establishments from the time when they can do without their mothers first care.

Question 20. Will not the introduction of common ownership of goods be accompanied by the proclamation of the sharing of women in common?

Answer. By no means. We will only interfere in the personal relationship between men and women or with the family in general to the extent that the maintenance of the existing institution disturbs the new social order. In addition, we are well aware that family relationships have been modified in the course of history by the property relations and during periods of development and that consequently the ending of private property will have a most important influence on it.

Question 21. Will nationalities continue to exist under Communism?

Answer. The peoples of those nations which join themselves together on the principle of common ownership will be compelled by this very union to mingle and to merge with one another and thereby to abolish themselves in the same way as the various differences between classes and estates disappear as a result of the elimination of their foundation—private property.

Question 22. Do Communists reject the existing religions?

Answer. All religions which have existed hitherto were expressions of historical stages of development of individual peoples or of popular masses. But Communism is that stage of historical development which makes all existing religions superfluous and will lead to their disappearance.

In the name and on the mandate of the Congress.

Secretary: Heide[2]

President: Karl Schill[3]

(Translated by Jack Cohen)

[2]Alias of Wilhelm Wolff.

[3]Alias of Carl Schapper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion Contributions on:

Socialism, Democracy and the One-Party System

Andrew Turner

Comrade Johnstone's introduction (*Marxism Today*, August 1970) states that a "passionate debate" is currently raging throughout the Communist and non-Communist world on the questions of Socialism, Democracy and the one party system. Since 1917 the Capitalist world has contributed to the debate, through a specially created ideological industry, and is usually prepared to resort to "passionate wars" whenever Socialist ideology and practice seems like getting the upper hand. Capitalism's hatred and fear of Socialism certainly hasn't changed; what is new, however, is that certain Communist Parties have entered into this arena. Out of this has arisen some fundamental disagreements with the fraternal Parties from the Socialist countries. It would be more honest if Comrade Johnstone admitted that only a minority of parties, namely the West European ones, are engaged in the debate from his particular viewpoint.

Lenin, in a postscript to one of his pamphlets wisely remarked: "It is more pleasant and useful to go through the 'experience of the revolution' than to write about it".[1]

The parties from the Socialist countries could adopt a similar attitude when comrades like Johnstone lecture the Socialist countries on questions and principles of Socialist construction and democracy. The Socialist countries are in a much better position to "theorise" on Democracy under Socialism for the current theories have been shaped by the inescapable concrete situation in which they have developed. Their approach is rooted in practical experience and such experience is the solid testing ground for any theory. Whilst some Western Parties pride themselves in posing the questions, the Socialist countries take credit for working toward their solution.

A Class Concept

Democracy is a class concept. No amount of theoretical shadow boxing can disguise this fact. Comrade Johnstone should supplement his studies of Marx and Engels on Democracy with Lenin's "Bourgeois and Proletarian Democracy". Lenin demonstrates the class approach to democracy; one year after the October Revolution he writes:

> "Proletarian democracy is a *million times*[2] more democratic than any bourgeois democracy; Soviet power is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic."

He warns:

> "To fail to see this one must either deliberately serve the Bourgeoisie, or be politically as dead as a door nail, unable to see real life from behind the dusty pages of bourgeois books, be thoroughly imbued with bourgeois democratic prejudices, and thereby objectively convert oneself into a lackey of the bourgeoisie".[3]

Such is the manner of presenting the question from a proletarian viewpoint. If Lenin claimed that Soviet power was a million times more democratic than any bourgeois republic after only *one year*, what is the position *today*, after fifty years of Soviet power? Put even more bluntly, has Soviet democracy in fifty years advanced or retracted? Only a rabid anti-Soviet would deny that tremendous advances have taken place in this field. Only individuals steeped in "bourgeois democratic prejudices" would argue that the temporary setbacks and mistakes created by the personality cult, had indeed permanently retarded Soviet democracy. Lastly, and most important, only opportunism would argue that the major cause for these mistakes lies in the structure of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the one party system. Do Comrade Johnstone and other critics of the one party system disagree with Lenin's writings on proletarian democracy? If they do they must openly say so.

Further on in his introduction Johnstone cites the "fear of people"—concerning the suppression

[1] The experience of the *Russian Revolutions* of 1905 and 1917.

[2] Lenin's emphasis.

[3] *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 28

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of all political opposition—when the communists take power; and then suggests how justified such fears are! "This conception", he writes, "cannot be dismissed as an arbitary capitalist invention". (Obviously not as far as he is concerned.) He quotes the Secretary of the Austrian Party to illustrate his point. Both are impressed by the remarkable "tenacity" for this capitalist conception to persist. The perpetuation of this myth has failed to surprise Marxist Parties in the past, why should it today? When has Imperialism ever surrendered or retarded in the battle of ideas, unless compelled to by pressure from the Labour Movement or in direct confrontation with the Socialist world. It has taken the Soviet Union over fifty years to bury the argument that Socialism *cannot work economically;* to expect capitalism to concede that Socialism is not only democratic (even from a bourgeois standard) but more democratic, is to believe in miracles not Marxism.

Pluralism

Comrade Johnstone disapproves that in the last few years some Socialist countries have attacked the conception of "pluralism" in the programmes of certain Western parties. We have the "right" it seems to attack the one party system, leading role of the Party, etc. as applied in the Socialist countries; that is Marxist and perfectly in order he suggests. On the other hand it is un-Marxist for the fraternal parties to defend themselves and reply to their critics. Johnstone is just discovering that no Party has a monopoly on polemics. Intentional or not, such is the tone and terminology of his approach.

Johnstone devotes the remainder of his discussion (part 1) examining the "holy of holies" (his expression)—the historical necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist state, and the leading role of the party. It would require a separate article to do full justice to his treatment of the above fundamentals. I will limit myself to making some brief comments; other contributors might be tempted to develop the points raised.

The section "Marxist views of parties", is extremely weak since his choice of quotes are no doubt selected as a theoretical justification for the main argument outlined in his introduction. The paragraph on Stalin merits special attention. Johnstone states that Stalin concocted a theory identifying socialism with a one party state "not only as necessary in the particular circumstances prevailing in the Soviet Union but also as implicit in a classless society". Not content with this Stalin proceeded to propagate this false "fundamental canon of Marxism" throughout the "*politically ignorant*" Third International. Lenin, however, addressing the Tenth Congress boldly claimed:

> "After two and a half years of the Soviet power we came out in the Communist International and told the world that the dictatorship of the Proletariat would not work except through the Communist Party".[4]

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Under the heading "Marx and Engels on Democracy", Johnstone correctly emphasises how deeply concerned Marx and Engels were for "winning the battle of democracy". This, of course is quite correct, but since the discussion is on Socialist Democracy it would be more appropriate to examine Marx and Engels conclusions on the Paris Commune and their later work concerning democracy and the withering away of the state.[5] Lenin paid particular attention to this important aspect. "The concepts of freedom and democracy are usually considered identical . . . by vulgar Marxists. . . . In fact, he continues, "Democracy excludes freedom. The dialectics (or course) of developments is as follows: from absolutism to bourgeois democracy; from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy; from proletarian democracy to no democracy at all".[6]

Over a hundred years ago Engels in one of his letters warned the movement that it should not be "misled by the unity fanatics".[7] Perhaps it would be appropriate to extend a similar warning to the movement today not to be misled by the "abstract" democracy brigade.

Johnstone's treatment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is hopelessly inadequate, particularly the inexcusable ommission of Lenin who creatively developed the ideas of Marx and Engels and put the whole concept into practice. In a footnote, Johnstone adds that no attempt will be made "to discuss this concept (The Dictatorship) except in relation to the specific theme of the article": what an evasive remark! His introduction promised us an examination of how the one party system emerged in the USSR, now we are informed that no analysis of the "dictatorship" is necessary "except in relation to his specific theme".

Johnstone demonstrates the form of his theme

---

[4] 10th Congress RCP (B), *Coll. Works*, Vol. 32, p. 199.

[5] See Lenin's *The State and Revolution*, especially the section *The Destruction of Parliamentarism.* Lenin analysing Marx's writing on the Commune makes this important point. "This remarkable criticism of Parliamentarianism in 1871 is also one of those of Marx's dicta which has been conveniently "forgotten", thanks to the prevalence of socialist chauvinism and opportunism."

[6] Preparatory material for the *State and Revolution*, *Coll. Works*, 5th Russian edition, Vol. 33, p. 170.

[7] Engels letter to Bebel, Sel. Cor. (Moscow), 1965, pp. 283-85.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when dealing with the Commune he fails to note its outstanding feature. Marx made the discovery that the "true secret" of the Commune, "was this . . . the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of Labour".[8] Lenin writes that the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917 ". . . in different circumstances and under different conditions, continue the work of the Commune and confirm Marx's brilliant historical analysis".[9] Johnstone is not ignorant of this fact yet chooses to ignore it, so that he can make the "original"[10] claim that "Nowhere did Marx or Engels suggest that the dictatorship should take the form of a one party state". (One could equally well argue that nowhere did they suggest that it should not). Lenin paid particular attention to this very question and reached a different conclusion:

> "The theory of the class struggle, applied by Marx to this question of the state and the Socialist revolution, leads as a matter of course to the recognition of the *political rule* of the proletariat, of its dictatorship, i.e. of *undivided* power directly backed by the armed force of the people".[11]

Perhaps Comrade Johnstone may argue in part 2 of his discussion that which he hints at in part 1 i.e. That the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Marxist theory is something entirely different to that materialised in the Soviet Union and other Socialist states. On this point a final word from Lenin:

> "Things have turned out differently from what Marx and Engels expected and we, the Russian working and exploited classes have the honour of being the vanguard of the international socialist revolution; we can now see clearly how far the development of the revolution will go. The Russians began it—the German, the Frenchman and the Englishman will finish it, and SOCIALISM WILL BE VICTORIOUS".[12]

[8] K. Marx, *The Civil War in France*, Marx-Engels, *Sel. Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 518-22.
[9] Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 431-32.
[10] My emphasis.
[11] *Ibid*, p. 404.
[12] Lenin, Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 472.

Jack Evans

Having now completed my reading of Monty Johnstone's treatise on "Socialism, Democracy and the One Party System", there are some points I would like to make.

Once I had got over the anger of seeing " " 's around the term Marxist when the views there expressed did not correspond to those being built up by Monty Johnstone, then my first reaction was "here we go again". And, I suppose, from this comes the real value of the work; for it made me, and, I hope, other comrades re-read Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Programme* and Lenin's arguments against Kautsky. And, nearer home, the arguments our own Tommy Jackson had with Raymond Postgate and Middleton Murray on the dialectic of revolution and the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat during the 1930's. In his book "Necessity of Communism" Middleton Murray had written:

> "The Russian Revolution ought to have been a bourgeois revolution, ideally speaking. That it wasn't was due, really, to the utter political and social backwardness of Russia . . . Russia will be the most backward State in the Communist world. It will have to learn the rudiments of civilisation still. In other words, Russia had to have a proletarian revolution because it was incapable of a bourgeois revolution. Whatever naïve Communists may believe, a nation simply cannot omit a necessary stage in human development without paying for it. It has to pass through the ethical equivalent of that economic stage."

Before he demolishes Murray's arguments, Tommy Jackson sums them up as follows:

> "Russia, you must understand, being a *nasty* country, got a *nasty* sort of Communism. Britain being, on the whole, a *nice* country can if it likes get a *nice* sort of Communism and it will serve as an antidote to the *nasty* Russian variety!".

Objective of Revolution

This is how I felt after reading Monty Johnstone's articles—and indeed it sums up the way in which the main ideological attack is being made today, from right, left and nationalist interests. To me, the objective of revolutionary policy is the conquest of power by the proletariat; the method is the extension of "the acceptance of class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Lenin—*State & Revolution*). And this means, as Marx pointed out, the smashing of the bourgeois state.

In the transition from capitalism to communism the fundamental question is which of the two classes whose antagonism was basic in the bourgeois order shall rule—any idea of a coalition of these classes is ruled out. Coalitions of parties which could represent variations of class interests are

(*completed on p.* 18)

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books from the U.S.S.R.

Available again:

A DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY
Ed. M. Rosenthal and P. Yudin

An invaluable reference work on philosophers ancient and modern, their schools, trends and terminology.
494 pp *Cloth* **25s (£1.25)**

AN ANTHOLOGY OF CHARTIST LITERATURE
Compiled by Y. V. Kovalyeva

A notable compilation by a Soviet scholar. Only the commentary and notes are in Russian: all the poems, stories and articles are as they originally appeared in *The Northern Star*, *The English Republic*, *The Friend of the People* and other Chartist publications.
413 pp *Cloth* (1956 Edition) **15s (75p)**

Forthcoming—early 1971:

BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY DURING WORLD WAR II
V. Trukhanovsky

This important book, first available in Russian in 1965, takes a close and critical look at the British Government's wartime dealings with its allies and enemies. Some of the official documents quoted have not yet been published in this country.
494 pp *Cloth* **25s (£1.25)**

THE COUNCIL FOR MUTUAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE: 20 YEARS
CMEA Secretariat

A survey, mainly chronological, of the activities of the CMEA and the substantial economic developments in CMEA countries.
107 pp *Cloth*

MOSCOW/STALINGRAD: 1941/42

Recollections, by various participants, of the epic battles of Moscow and Stalingrad.
279 pp *Numerous illustrations* *Cloth*

CENTRAL BOOKS LIMITED
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8PS

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW 1970

No. 11

includes

J. DUCLOS
FIFTY YEARS OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

COMPLETING THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN—A NEW STAGE IN SOVIET AGRICULTURE

O. BOGOMOLOV
ECONOMIC INTEGRATION OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Price 2s. 6d. (13p.) plus postage
30s. (£1.50) for one year
from
CENTRAL BOOKS LIMITED
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8PS

A Challenging New Pamphlet for all those fighting the Tory attacks on the unions and social services

WHAT IS THE SOCIALIST WAY FORWARD?

by John Gollan
Price 1/6d.

Available from Central Books Ltd.
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8PS

This pamphlet is the first in a series to be published by the Communist Party under the general heading "A SOCIALIST LIBRARY" which will deal with fundamental problems of socialism and the struggle for it in Britain and throughout the world. The next pamphlet in the series will be "THE FUTURE OF MAN" by James Klugmann, based upon the very popular series of articles by the author which first appeared in the "Morning Star".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

January publication

JIM ARNISON

THE MILLION POUND STRIKE

A graphic account of the strike for trade union recognition at the Roberts Arundel Works, Stockport in 1969.

40p

Already Published

FIRST DECREES OF SOVIET POWER

Collected together for the first time in English, the fundamental decrees enacted by the Russian Soviet Government in 1917-18.

£3

THE WORLD OF THE RANTERS

A. L. Morton

The Ranters were accused of—among other things—"drunkenness, uncleanness, blasphemous words, filthy songs and mixt dances of men and women stark naked". This book is about left-wing preachers and prophets, movements and sects as unacceptable to Parliamentary men of property as to their Royalist enemies.

£2.75

Lawrence & Wishart

SCIENCE & SOCIETY

Volume 34, No. 4 Winter, 1970

American Radical History

Historians and American Socialism 1900-1920 *Bryan Strong*

Socialist Party Decline and World War I *Sally M. Miller*

Communism in California, 1919-1924—"Orders from Moscow"? *Ralph E. Shaffer*

Some Reflections on Ideology and American Labor History *Philip S. Foner*

California Communists: Their Years of Power *Steve Murdock*

PLUS

A winner in our 1970 Essay Contest: The Young Marx on the State *Thomas F. McGovern, S.J.*

Book Reviews

Subscription: $6.00 per year ($6.50 outside of U.S.)

Single issue: $1.50 ($1.65 outside of U.S.)

30 East 20th Street New York, N.Y. 10003

COMMENT

***Comment* is the Communist Party's weekly paper.**
***Comment* is a news review and comment upon current affairs.**
***Comment* provides background information and facts on problems, peoples, parties and policies at home and overseas.**
***Comment* carries the principal statements of the British Communist Party and information about the Party's work. It tells you what the Communist, Socialist and progressive movement is doing throughout the world. Its articles explain the theory of socialism and the way of advance to socialism in Britain.**

Price 1s. Order from Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WB1X 8PS or usual agents.

Subscription £4.20 (£4 4s)—1 year
£2.25 (£2 5s)—6 months

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED